



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 2012

No. 98

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 27, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RICHARD B. NUGENT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 17, 2012, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

COMPANION CARE WORKERS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALBERG. Rising health care costs remain a top concern for many Americans, particularly the Baby Boomers heading off into retirement and individuals with disabilities. However, one service in particular—home companion care—has come under attack from the Department of Labor and faces a sharp rise in costs. Currently, the Fair Labor Standards Act provides exemptions for home care workers. And for more than four dec-

ades now, the exemption has helped seniors and individuals with disabilities maintain access to affordable in-home care.

Companion care workers play a crucial role for those who desire to remain independent, performing a range of everyday tasks like helping to prepare meals, opening the mail, providing light housekeeping, and even offering someone to talk with, which is immensely helpful. However, the greatest service these individuals play is providing families with a sense that mom or dad or their loved ones are not alone when we need to be away.

But in December of 2011, the Department of Labor introduced a proposal championed by President Obama to remove the companionship exemption from the Fair Labor Standards Act, a move which would virtually eliminate the current exemption. On top of that, it will raise costs for businesses and families and lead to reduced hours for home companion care workers. Even the Department estimates the cost of companion care under the proposed rule may increase by up to \$2.3 billion over the first 10 years. It will be families and seniors and the disabled that will struggle to pay these costs out of their own pockets. These changes run in stark contrast to what Congress intended when it first established this important exemption nearly four decades ago. While I recognize the delivery of services has evolved over the years, the need to maintain access to affordable in-home care has not.

Seniors and the disabled in my home State of Michigan have been devastated by the fallout from this flawed policy. In 2006, Michigan made similar changes to the State law that the Department of Labor is currently considering. This was confirmed by a constituent in my home State who testified that his home companion care business, employees, and clients are worse off since the change went into ef-

fect. Seniors, those with disabilities, and their families are often unable to pay higher prices for the overtime requirement, forcing them to take on different caregivers throughout the day. This disruption to their schedule takes away the certainty of working with trusted caregivers. Many seniors and individuals with disabilities are then left with no choice but to leave their own homes because of the cost.

In response, I have introduced two bills to ensure seniors and individuals with disabilities keep their access to affordable companion care. Both bills will also prevent the Federal Government from interfering with decisions that should be made by families. The first bill, H.R. 5969, the Ensuring Access to Affordable and Quality Companion Care Act, will clarify that home caregivers employed by a third-party employer or living with the individuals receiving care continue to be exempt from the requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The second, H.R. 5970, The Protecting in-Home Care From Government Intrusion Act, will stop the Secretary of Labor from finalizing or enforcing a proposed rule that severely narrows the Fair Labor Standards Act exemption for in-home caregivers.

If the Obama administration's proposal is not stopped, home care workers will lose hours and possibly their jobs. Seniors and those with disabilities will lose affordable care they want and need. This is simply a risk that we cannot afford to take.

TRANSPORTATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. There's a transportation agreement rumored to be in the works that would be shortsighted in the extreme if these rumors prove to

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4067

be accurate. Our problem was created because for years Congress and the last two administrations have been unwilling to deal meaningfully with the large gap of funding for transportation created because we rely on an outmoded funding system based on the number of gallons of fuel consumed. With more efficient gas and diesel vehicles augmented by more hybrids, plug-in hybrids, and electric cars, the transportation trust fund is locked into an inevitable downward spiral. Like the looming Social Security deficit, the longer we wait, the worse it will get.

Not this year, but over the next few years, we should temporarily increase and then replace the gas tax with a system that is based on the amount of road use. The new legislation should be laying the foundation for this transition. Unfortunately, it doesn't.

The rumored agreement would also take us backward on enabling alternative modes of transportation. In the last 20 years of transportation reform we've used enhancement funding to get more out of the transportation projects. These include long-neglected and wildly popular bike and pedestrian safety programs such as Safe Routes to School. In a recent Princeton survey, 83 percent of the public wanted these programs maintained or the funding increased. They place an emphasis on intermodalism so that transportation modes work together and minimize direct conflict between truckers, rail, and commuters that can paralyze not just transportation but transportation planning.

From what I hear, efforts to provide incentives to "fix it first" are being undercut. It's never as popular to maintain what you've got in face of the drumbeat of a few focused special interests for a new particular project. But "fixing it first" creates more transportation jobs, provides more safety, alleviates congestion and pollution, and has more overall economic impact. And it, of course, alleviates long-term pressure to create more roads that we can't adequately maintain.

The bill before us also misses an opportunity to reform the system to have more performance-based environmental protections. We absolutely can make the process work better and faster. But the answer is not to gut the protections, which will only create more conflict and ultimately more delays. Projects take more time when they're not done right, when citizens are not involved with the plan, and the myriad of interests aren't working together. Involving the public in the planning process works.

I'll never forget a conversation with a very conservative Republican mayor of Phoenix, who told me that it was only when they got the citizens working together on a balanced transportation program of transit and roads that they were able to get the resources and the momentum to go forward.

I will be extremely disappointed if the legislation shatters the coalition that I have been working for years to develop for the big picture, the big programs, and proper funding that's going to be necessary if we're going to be successful. It will be wrong if we have a scaled-down 2-year extension that will make it harder to give the American public what they need, adequate resources that are sustainable over time, more economic opportunity, and more construction and maintenance employment.

A good transportation program will protect the environment, enhance the quality of life, making our communities more livable and our families safer, healthier and more economically secure.

□ 1010

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, it has been very interesting the last couple of weeks. I have been listening to my colleagues on both sides talking about the debt, the deficit, spending, cutting, all of this, going on and on. Then I got to thinking, and I heard about this book and I went out and bought the book. The book title is "Funding the Enemy: How U.S. Taxpayers Bankroll the Taliban," by Douglas Wissing. The book is a must-read for the American people.

I want to share a synopsis of this book:

With the vague intention of winning hearts and minds in Afghanistan, the U.S. Government has mismanaged billions of development and logistics dollars, bolstered the drug trade, and dumped untold millions into Taliban hands.

That is the sobering message of this scathing critique of our war effort in Afghanistan by investigative journalist Douglas Wissing. According to Wissing, America has already lost the war. It draws on the voices of hundreds of combat soldiers, ordinary Afghans, private contractors, aid workers, international consultants, and government officials. From these contacts, it became glaringly clear, as the author details, that American taxpayer dollars have been flowing into Taliban coffers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to you a critique of the book given by former State Department foreign service officer Peter van Buren:

Sober, sad, and important, "Funding the Enemy" peels back the layers of American engagement in Afghanistan to reveal its rotten core: that United States' dollars meant for the country's future instead fund the insurgency and support the Taliban. Paying for both sides of the war ensures America's ultimate defeat.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this to the floor for this reason: I continue to be amazed that both sides want to continue to spend \$10 billion a month in Afghani-

stan. It is borrowed money from the Chinese, and there is no concern. We just spend more and more money to support President Karzai, who is a corrupt leader. And as this book says, have the American taxpayer bankroll the Taliban.

The American people have said in poll after poll: Bring our troops home now. As many as 72 to 73 percent of the American people say bring our people home now. Our soldiers have won the war. Bin Laden is dead; al Qaeda is dispersed.

I hope that Members of Congress will find the time to read this book, and I hope the American people will read this book and be outraged, as I am outraged, how our taxpayers are funding the Taliban so they can kill Americans.

Wake up, Congress. Let's get together and bring our troops home from Afghanistan and do what's right for the American people. But more importantly, do what's right for our men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. And God, within Your loving arms, hold the families who've given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I ask God to bless the House and Senate, my friends on both sides, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God. And I ask God to bless President Obama that he will do what is right in the eyes of God. And I will ask three times, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

ARIZONA IMMIGRATION POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. This week, the U.S. Supreme Court declared the immigration policy of the State of Arizona, a policy that Mitt Romney has called "a model for America," to be largely unconstitutional. I applaud the Court for stating that immigration enforcement is a Federal responsibility.

The "show me your papers" law allows police to demand that individuals prove that they are legally in this country. This law is not just a problem for people who are undocumented. It's not just a problem for immigrants. It's not just a problem for anybody who looks like they might have come to America from somewhere else. It's a problem for every American who cares about freedom. It's a problem for all of us who believe no person should be treated as a suspect based on how they look, their accent, or the spelling of their name.

In Arizona today, all that stands between you and a legal nightmare is whether a police officer feels there is a reasonable suspicion to inquire about your country of origin. Yet Arizona politicians will tell you, with a straight face no less, that they can

apply this law without using racial profiling, without assuming that someone named Gutierrez isn't less likely to be in this country legally than someone named Smith.

That's an amazing skill. Maybe with practice, we can all become like Arizona politicians and police officers who are able to telepathically determine who to accuse of not belonging in America.

But let's take a quiz together this morning and learn how to pick out the suspect. Here are two journalists, Geraldo Rivera and Ted Koppel.

At a traffic stop, to the untrained eye, we might guess that Geraldo Rivera, for some reason that clearly has nothing to do with the way he looks, might not be from America. Geraldo Rivera's mustache wouldn't confuse an Arizona law enforcement professional. They would know that Geraldo Rivera was born in Brooklyn, New York, and that Ted Koppel was born in Europe, in England, where his parents moved to flee from Hitler and Nazi Germany.

Round two, this for our young fans of C-SPAN. This is Justin Bieber and Selena Gomez. These young people have overcome their very different national origins and become apparently a happy couple. I'm sure Justin helped Gomez learn all about American customs and feel more at home in her adopted country. Oh, wait a minute. I'm sorry, because I'm not a trained Arizona official, I somehow got that backwards. Actually, Ms. Gomez, of Texas, has helped Mr. Bieber, of Canada, learn about his adopted country.

Justin, when you perform in Phoenix, remember to bring your papers.

The next round shows how tricky Arizona's game of pick out the immigrant is to play. Here are two basketball superstars. Neither one is Latino. That's confusing already. You have to dig deeper to figure out who isn't the real American. So let's consider their names—Jeremy Lin and Tony Parker. Clearly, "Lin" sounds kind of foreign while "Tony Parker" sounds American to me. But I'm not an Arizona police officer who would know that Jeremy Lin was born in Los Angeles, and Tony Parker—oops—Europe, Belgium. Wrong once again.

Finally, here's just one more.

In case the Supreme Court ever wants to meet in Phoenix to consider its ruling about Arizona's "show me your papers" law, if these two Justices step out to Starbucks, which one do you think is likeliest to be a suspect, the Anglo male or the Latina? Neither is an immigrant, but Antonin Scalia's father came through Ellis Island from Italy, and Sonia Sotomayor is a proud Puerto Rican with generations of U.S. citizen ancestors.

We could play this game all day, but the point is simple. The idea that any government official can determine who belongs in America and who doesn't simply by looking at them is completely ridiculous, unfair, and un-American, and yet this absurdity is the law of Arizona.

The Court signaled that it will be watching this law closely, and it should, because we count on the Court to protect our liberties, not restrict them.

□ 1020

Because, in America, people should always be judged by their actions. No person, not one, should be judged by the way they look, the sound of their voice, or the pronunciation of their last name—not in Arizona, not anywhere, not ever.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

AMERICAN CENTER FOR THE CURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, as the Supreme Court is about to rule on the health care law, Americans all across the country are focusing again on health care.

Health care makes up about one-fifth of the United States' economy, and it is increasingly taking up a larger share of our Federal budget, so it's important that we look to implement strategies that bend the cost curve down.

Scientific research over the years has enhanced our understanding of disease and has continuously led to many breakthrough treatments. However, it is critical that we emphasize not just treatment, but specifically cures for diseases as well.

Last year, the United States Government spent just under \$32 billion to help the National Institutes of Health carry out its critical mission: seeking fundamental knowledge about the nature and behavior of living systems, applying that knowledge to enhance health, lengthen life, and reduce the burdens of illness and disability.

The NIH, Mr. Speaker, has earned a proud reputation for its research and has made a positive impact in the health care world. I'm a firm supporter of the NIH, and I spoke this past March to the House Budget Committee about the importance of funding NIH's mission. However, I also believe that we can always do more with the resources that we have and believe that we should refocus a portion of our health care resources toward a new mission. One idea that has been brought to me is a center that concentrates exclusively on eliminating diseases rather than continuing the practice of just treating diseases.

This center, known as the American Center for Cures, would be a public-private partnership that utilizes the resources of the government with the creativity and accountability of the private sector to find cures for the diseases that in some way affect almost everyone on the planet—diabetes, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, just to name a new.

By bringing our Nation's best and brightest minds together, from business boardrooms to scientists from around the world, the center would singularly devote its efforts to curing diseases by establishing renewed lines of communication amongst the world's most reputable scientists, funding collaborative research, unblocking bottlenecks in clinical research, facilitating speedy clinical trials, and ensuring that the research performed remains focuses on outcomes and results.

In addition to promoting the United States as the leading place for innovations and pioneering medical research, finding cures to some of mankind's deadliest diseases would also have global implications. The money saved by not having to dedicate it to treating or managing a disease could be freed up and invested in education, infrastructure, and deficit reduction, and we would be able to further help raise the standards of living for everyone in developing nations and around the globe.

During these difficult fiscal times, Mr. Speaker, here in our own country we have to start thinking differently. Today, we spend approximately \$235 billion annually on treating diabetes alone. Think about the cost if we add Alzheimer's and Parkinson's. If the American Center for Cures could find a cure, think about the possibilities. Think about the good we could do, for instance, with 235 billion extra dollars right here. That's what we spend in our country. Think about what gets spent all around the globe.

We need to start thinking differently, Mr. Speaker. Change is hard, and change in Washington is even harder, but I believe that we have an obligation, as stewards of our taxpayers' hard-earned money, not only to effectively allocate their tax dollars in a manner that produces results, but change the way that we look at all the possibilities for our future. This mission could impact not just every American life, but every human on the planet.

ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER CONTEMPT VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank my colleagues in the Congressional Black, Hispanic, and Asian Pacific American Caucuses for coming to the floor to denounce the deeply partisan and divisive effort by congressional Republicans to hold Attorney General Holder in contempt. We need to be doing what the American people elected us to do, and that is to create jobs and to get our economy back on its feet.

This contempt vote stands in stark contrast to our duties in Congress. We should be devoting our time to creating jobs, addressing our Nation's neglected infrastructure, and ensuring that student loan rates don't balloon starting next week.

Too many hardworking American families are looking for their next paycheck, and yet this Tea Party-led Republican Congress is wasting precious legislative time and energy on a purely partisan effort to generate conflict where none exists.

The Republicans' claims against Attorney General Holder defy belief. The simple fact is the Bush administration developed the inappropriate tactics, and once this Justice Department, under President Obama, learned about it, Attorney General Holder stopped the program—stopped it.

So instead of handling our Nation's priorities, this Tea Party-led Republican Congress is choosing to stick its head in the sand, ignoring the wide range of documents and open cooperation provided by the Justice Department but now engage in a game of political theater with no regard for struggling families across America.

The true motivation behind this contempt resolution is simple: As Leader PELOSI remarked last week, this is really about suppressing voter turnout. The National Rifle Association, unfortunately, has insisted that their supported Members of Congress vote for it or face political peril.

Let me tell you, these Tea Party Republicans don't like it when their ideological efforts to prevent people from voting get blocked by the Justice Department doing its job—and that's defending the Constitution of the United States. They know they can't win in judicial courts and they cannot win in the court of public opinion, so instead they're doing all they can to undermine the Justice Department by dragging Attorney General Holder through the mud, making endless demands, changing the goal posts, and monopolizing his time so that they can continue their efforts to undermine the democratic process. And they're asking for information that would violate the law. Furthermore, this is unprecedented. The House has never voted to hold an Attorney General in contempt.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are sick and tired of seeing these Tea Party Republicans pursue a senseless and destructive agenda. There's a reason that Congress has the lowest approval rating in history, and it has everything to do with efforts like this—a contempt vote that does nothing to improve the economy, does nothing to create jobs, and does nothing to strengthen our middle class or to help those trying to raise themselves out of poverty.

We need to invest in transportation, in education, and in ensuring above all that jobs and jobs and more jobs are added to our economic recovery. We only have a matter of weeks before Congress effectively shuts down for the August recess, and we cannot waste any more time doing anything other than putting Americans back to work. Jobs should be our number one priority, our number two priority, and our number three priority.

So I join my colleagues in the tri-caucuses calling for an end to this useless path of petty politics. Let us work during the remainder of time we have this congressional session to do the work that we were sent here to do. No more political witch hunts, no more political fishing expeditions, no more excuses. It's time to get back to work.

IMMIGRATION POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, two new words were added to the American immigration policy: "Prosecutorial discretion."

Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano recently ordered Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials to not deport certain classes of aliens who are in the country illegally. Instead, these illegal aliens will be given 2-year work permits that can be renewed indefinitely. The reason Secretary Napolitano and President Obama have given the American people for this de facto amnesty program is prosecutorial discretion.

The Secretary and the President claim that the Department of Homeland Security personnel can use their discretion to decide what individuals they can and cannot deport. But in Federal immigration law, this discretion does not exist. Congress took it away from the executive branch in 1996 when it passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act.

□ 1030

The law requires, and I will repeat that, this law requires immigration officials to address illegal aliens when they become aware that they are in the country illegally. It clearly spells out the actions that must be taken by Federal officials.

In fact, according to one of the Nation's leading experts on immigration, Congress, frustrated at the time because the Clinton administration was using it to let thousands of illegal aliens remain in the United States, wrote the law to remove that discretion. In other words, the discretion that President Obama and Secretary Napolitano claim they use no longer exists because Congress deliberately eliminated it in 1996. By stating they still have it, President Obama and Secretary Napolitano are actually ordering Federal immigration officials to break the law.

Since the executive branch is citing a privilege that no longer exists in ordering Federal immigration officials to break the 1996 immigration act which was passed by Congress and signed into law, today, I'm calling on the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees to hold hearings to investigate the legality of this decision to use so-called "prosecutorial discretion."

Just this week we heard from the United States Supreme Court that because the Federal Government writes immigration laws, State laws must work in harmony with the Federal Government. In striking down part of Arizona's S.B. 1070, the High Court's majority said that Federal law shall be the supreme law of the land when laws do not work in harmony with the Federal scheme or when Federal law is explicit. Well, in this case, the law is very clear: there is no prosecutorial discretion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my district in Pennsylvania has one of the highest unemployment rates in the State, and our country is still reeling from one of the worst recessions we have ever faced. The Department of Homeland Security's unlawful action could have grave consequences on our labor force and on our economy, both at the local and national levels.

Additionally, allowing individuals with forged documents to remain in this country could pose a serious threat to our homeland security.

Let me also state that I am troubled by the expansion of the authority of the President that he believes he has. In the past, President Obama clearly stated he had to follow existing immigration laws. During a town hall meeting with Univision in March 2011, he said:

America is a Nation of laws, which means I, as the President, am obligated to enforce the law. I don't have a choice about that.

During that same town hall meeting, President Obama also said:

There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system, that for me to simply, through executive order, ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President.

So what changed? In the last 15 months, did Congress grant the President new powers? I don't remember doing that. Fifteen months ago, President Obama said he can't ignore congressional mandates. But suddenly, 2 weeks ago, he can? Again, I ask, what changed?

I'm concerned President Obama overstepped his constitutional authority in this case, just as he did in claiming executive privilege in Operation Fast and Furious. That's why these two committees must hold formal hearings and investigate this claim of discretion and the unilateral rewriting of Federal immigration policy.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the centerpiece of President Obama's 2008 Presidential campaign was the promise of health care reform. He told us, time and time again, that every President has seen the urgency of reform, that all of them had attempted reform, and none succeeded.

President Obama reminded us of the fact that having more than 40 million uninsured Americans is unacceptable. It is not only bad for the individual, but it is for the American economy. It is bad for hospitals who absorb the loss for these indigent patients or shift the costs to other patients.

During the campaign, the President went on to painfully highlight the unfair practices of some insurance companies in making people think they have quality insurance policies, when, in fact, in many instances, it is not worth the paper it is written on.

After fierce debate, and after the right-wing Tea Party instilled unfounded fear in the hearts of good Americans, the Congress passed the Affordable Care Act, and it is good policy for the American people. But there are those who have exploited the legitimacy of the Affordable Care Act, and now we await a ruling from the Supreme Court on the act's constitutionality.

Should the Supreme Court decide to undermine the most vital provision of the law, the individual mandate, one thing will be clear: it would be an act of judicial activism and judicial overreach, placing the Court firmly in the role of Congress.

Precedent for the Affordable Care Act already exists. Social Security is a program which all Americans are required to pay into and to participate. Car insurance is mandated in almost every State; yet the Supreme Court is on precipice of possible unfastening the linchpin that makes true health care reform attainable.

Such a decision would confiscate benefits that the public and businesses largely support. Lifetime coverage limits could be re-imposed on 100 million Americans. Seventeen million children with preexisting conditions could lose insurance coverage, and 6 million young adults may be forced off their parents' insurance plans.

Preservation of this law means 40 million uninsured Americans will be insured. It creates state-run health exchanges to give consumers maximum choice when selecting a policy, and it contains skyrocketing costs in medical care. The Affordable Care Act will lower insurance premiums driven by uncompensated care for the uninsured, saving the average family in North Carolina \$1,400 a year.

Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act has already paid great dividends in my district. Under the law, 94,000 seniors have received Medicare preventive services without paying a dime. More than 5,000 young adults have health insurance when they previously did not. About 400 small businesses received tax credits to expand care to their employees; 34,000 children with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied.

As a policy-maker representing 700,000 people, I hope the act will remain intact. As a former judge, I hope the Supreme Court recognizes the im-

pact an unfavorable decision will have on the role of Congress.

We cannot let the perfect, Mr. Speaker, be the enemy of the good. We should explore ways to improve upon the law instead of ways to further deny Americans access to affordable health care.

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY OF MISCHIEF AND INTERVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced legislation, H.R. 5993, that would prohibit the President from providing military or paramilitary aid of any sort to any faction in the internal fighting in Syria. Unfortunately, it appears that the administration is already very much involved in supporting the overthrow of the Assad government.

There's nary a whimper of criticism in Congress over our growing involvement in the civil war in Syria. The only noise we hear from Congress, and repeated in the media, is the complaint that we're not doing enough and that immediate, direct U.S. military action must be taken.

Tragically, our political leaders show both bad judgment and short memories when it comes to the downside of our foreign policy of mischief and intervention. Our compulsion to engage ourselves in every conflict around the world is dangerous to our national security.

In dealing with Syria, the administration pretends to pursue diplomacy and provide humanitarian assistance to the people. In reality, the U.S. Government facilitates weapons transfers to the rebels who are demanding immediate regime change.

My goal is to stop our dangerous participation in the violence in Syria; yet evidence mounts that we're already deeply involved, with no expectation that the administration will back away from military engagement.

□ 1040

Recent reports indicate that the U.S. is providing logistics and communication assistance to the rebel forces. Assistance in getting arms to the rebels through surrogates is hardly a secret. Cooperating with the rebels' propaganda efforts has been reported and is used to prepare the American people for our coming involvement.

There is every reason to expect that the well-laid plans to, once again, coordinate a favorable regime change will end badly. Even the strongest supporters of our direct and immediate military involvement in Syria admit that the rebel forces are made up of many groups, including al Qaeda, and no one is sure to whom the assistance should be given. All they claim is the need for the immediate removal of Assad.

This policy is nothing new, and too often in our recent history our assist-

ance with dollars and weapons used to overthrow a government ends up with the weapons being used, instead, against us. The blow-back from our policy of intervention has caused a great deal of harm to us since World War II:

Propping up the Shah in Iran for 26 years was a powerful factor in motivating radical Islamists to eventually overthrow the Shah in 1979. The hostages taken at the U.S. Embassy at that time was as a consequence of our putting the Shah into power in 1953;

In working with the mujahadeen in the 1980s, our CIA supported radical Islam in an effort to combat communist occupation in Afghanistan. Later, this led to the radical Islamists' hatred being turned against us over our occupation and interference in Muslim countries;

The \$40 billion given to Egypt for over 30 years to prop up the Mubarak dictatorship and to buy an unstable peace with Israel has ended with what appears to be the takeover of Egypt by the Muslim Brotherhood. They may well turn Egypt into a theocratic Islamic state unless our CIA is able to, once again, gain control. Al Qaeda now has a presence in parts of Egypt and has been involved in the bombing of the pipelines carrying gas to Israel. This is hardly a policy that is enhancing Israel's security.

What are the possible unintended consequences of this policy if we foolishly escalate the civil war in Syria?

The worst scenario would be an all-out war in the region involving Russia, the United States, Israel, Iran, Turkey, and others. The escalating conflict could rapidly make containment virtually impossible.

Chaos in this region could encourage the Kurds in Syria, Iraq, Turkey, and Iran to decide it's an opportunity to move on their long-sought-after goal of establishing a Kurdish state. Significant hostilities in the region would jeopardize the free flow of oil from the Middle East, causing sharp increases in the price of oil. The already weak economy of the West would suffer immensely. Some will argue erroneously that a major war would be beneficial to the economy and distract the people from their economic woes.

War, however, is never an economic benefit, although many have been taught that for many decades. If liberty and prosperity are to be our goals, peace is a necessary ingredient of that process.

PARTISAN ACRIMONY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Tomorrow will be a peculiar day in Washington and in American politics.

Republicans will denounce ideas that they enthusiastically supported until those ideas became associated somehow with the Obama administration.

We expect to hear the ruling on the individual mandate across the street at the Supreme Court. The individual mandate was the centerpiece of Republican health care proposals until the Obama administration embraced it. Then the Republicans decided it was an outrageous infringement on personal liberty.

Here in this Chamber, we will debate Operation Fast and Furious. Most Democrats, including me, don't really even quite get what the supposed scandal is about, but have always thought that gun sales in large quantities to drug cartels was just generally a bad idea. For Republicans, on the other hand, the gun sales that were part of Operation Fast and Furious appear to be the only gun sales they've ever had a problem with. We will also have a 180-degree reversal on the issue of information that Congress can require as part of our oversight powers.

I was an Oversight Subcommittee chairman for 4 years. I believe congressional oversight is an important check on the executive branch of government, an established, important part of our Republic system of checks and balances. I support investigations that might make an administration of my own party look foolish or worse. I want people who have the power of government, of either party, to be accountable for their decisions. I want them to pause over how they will explain their decisions in public; and if they can't explain them, maybe they shouldn't do it. Congressional oversight exposes and deters abuses of power and garden-variety stupidity of which there is plenty in the public sector, in the private sector, and in all activities in which human beings are involved.

But the courts have also recognized that uninhibited, candid discussions improve decisions. Decisions are less likely to be stupid when they are carefully discussed, and the courts protect the privacy of some discussions within the executive branch to further the goal of fewer stupid decisions. The courts recognize a strong privilege for discussion between the President and his top advisers and a lesser privilege, a qualified privilege, for other debates within the executive branch.

When I was an Oversight Subcommittee chairman, I read many of the court decisions that discussed those privileges. Anyone who says that the law is clear, in that what is privileged and what is not is well defined, is misinformed or dishonest.

Five years ago, the Democratic majority disagreed with a Republican President over whether information we sought as part of our oversight powers was privileged. There was plenty of partisan acrimony at the time, but we found a simple solution. We filed a lawsuit to ask a judge to decide whether we were entitled to the testimony and the documents that we had subpoenaed. The Bush administration argued that the court shouldn't decide the case. The judge disagreed. The judge

said that enforcing subpoenas and deciding what testimony or documents are privileged is something courts do every day. Judges expect lawyers to make careful, calm arguments based on the law and the facts; and they have little patience for tedious, dishonest talking points or personal attacks.

The debate here tomorrow will not even remotely resemble a legal argument in court. So we could go now to a court to clarify the law. I would support that—but no. Instead, House Republicans are going to force a vote to prosecute the Attorney General for the crime of taking a plausible position on uncertain legal issues. Instead of asking for a careful, calm decision by a judge on a legal issue, House Republicans are choosing an intemperate, acrimonious debate here in this Chamber over legal issues about which few Members have the first clue.

Why? The only possible reason is that House Republicans just like partisan acrimony.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SPECIALIST JARROD LALLIER, AN AMERICAN HERO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMorris Rodgers) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heart full of sadness and sorrow to honor the life of Specialist Jarrod Lallier.

Jarrold was a proud member of the prestigious 82nd Airborne Division, serving his first tour in Afghanistan. He was a graduate of Mead High School and a lifelong resident of Spokane, Washington. He was an athlete, a son, a brother, and an American hero.

Jarrold was just 20 years old when he lost his life last week in Afghanistan. He was just 20 years old when men in Afghan police uniforms turned their weapons on his unit and robbed him of his life. He was just 20 years old when he said goodbye to his family forever.

He would have celebrated his 21st birthday this week.

But since he is not here to do that, I want to celebrate the life he lived and the country he served.

Today, we celebrate a man who dreamed of serving America since he was young. We celebrate a man who fought for America, who protected America, who defended America. We celebrate a man who died in the name of American freedom.

Today, my thoughts and prayers and gratitude are with Specialist Jarrod Lallier and with all those who will carry on his legacy forever: his father, Gary; his mother, Kim; his sister, Jessica; and his brother, Jordan.

May God bless this great American hero, his family, and all the brave men and women who have answered America's call to freedom.

□ 1050

THE PATHWAY OF CONTEMPT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. Jackson Lee) for 5 minutes.

Ms. Jackson Lee of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is a solemn place and a solemn moment when Members come to express their views.

A previous speaker drew us to heroes, and we thank those who have served us in the United States military. This morning I draw us toward constitutional and congressional responsibility. It is all intertwined in the honor that we have in serving in this august institution entrusted to us by the American public, our individual constituents.

I first suggest that earlier this week the Supreme Court established the superiority of the United States Government in immigration reform. In all of the points that were brought by the State of Arizona, two-thirds were rejected under the understanding and the law that the United States Government is in charge of immigration enforcement, immigration benefits, and that we should do our job.

For the one provision that remained standing—and as the ranking member formally of the Immigration Subcommittee and on Homeland Security, I see this every day. Having just come from Arizona, I have seen the good work Congressman Grijalva and Congressman Pastor and others are doing. I know that we are working to ensure the safety of the border, but I also recognize the need for the dignity of human beings. I fight for the dignity.

Congress should get out of the way in terms of being in the midst of confusion and stand in the way and close the gap on immigration reform. The only provision left standing was a provision that the Court warned the State that if they engage in racial profiling, that too may be proven unconstitutional.

Law enforcement officers have always had the right in a legitimate stop to ask for the credentials of anyone they stop. The question is now burdening those officers to see who they stop and why they stop. Again, I speak to the issue of congressional responsibility.

Now I come to the act that is going to take place tomorrow, and a number of us are writing the Speaker and asking and imploring him, as Speaker Newt Gingrich did in 1998, refusing to bring forward a contempt charge against Janet Reno that was pointedly personal. We suggest now that there is much work to be done. As my colleague indicated, this case could be taken to the courts to determine what documents should be brought in.

In addition, the work has not been completed. Kenneth Melson, who headed the ATF, has never been allowed to speak before the committee to explain that he never told any of the officials, including the Attorney General, about the intricacies of Fast and Furious. The former Attorney General, who has

appeared before the Judiciary Committee on a number of times, I know that he would not in any way flee from coming and telling what he knew. General Mukasey, he has not been asked.

There have been 7,600 documents presented to the Oversight Committee, but yet we will be on the floor tomorrow in a purely personal relating of why Attorney General Holder, a life-long law enforcement officer, the senior officer of the United States, the one who has come riding in and helping the most vulnerable in the United States, those who cannot get to vote, the disabled, and others who have been denied by the oppressive rules that have been passed by many States.

Thank God for the Federal Government and the attorney general of the United States. If it had not been for him, I would not be standing here because I would have still been bent down in the Deep South with hoses on top of me because the General of the United States in the 1960s and the Department of Justice came in and helped Dr. Martin Luther King after Bull Connor turned those hoses on in Birmingham.

Tomorrow we malign the very officer that has come to the aid of any American, those whose homes are being foreclosed. This General led a massive settlement to be able to stand and to be able to provide for the most vulnerable of Americans.

Congress has the responsibility of creating jobs, of passing an important transportation HUD bill that will provide housing and rebuilding of our highways and freeways. Tomorrow we will stop and pause and begin to call each other names and to take a man whose very life has been in public service, who has led the Department of Justice with dignity and respect, who has answered questions, who has prepared, who has appeared before us with a demeanor that is respective of his position. All I ask is that we not bring this to the floor and cooler heads will come and sit down and resolve the remaining documents.

For the love of this Nation, for the patriotism and the honor of serving in the United States Congress, I beg of this Speaker and this House: Do not go down the pathway of contempt. I beg of you to raise this House to a level of dignity.

THERE GOES THE RULE OF LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my friend from Texas. We do have some disagreements, but I want to go back to the issue of jobs.

People are hurting. Without jobs, the unemployment has been higher than the President said it would ever get if we would just simply give him about a trillion dollars to give away to his friends, that that would make it all better. Well, it didn't.

What we've seen over and over from this administration is a complete disregard for the rule of law. When you look at all the people who have been drawn into this country illegally, in violation of our immigration laws—even though there is no country in the world that allows the immigration that this country does and the wide open gates that we do. But we do have parameters.

We've been told there may be a billion, billion and a half people who want to come to this country. If they did all at once, they would overwhelm us, and there would be no country for others to come to.

Why do so many want to come here? It's because we've always had regard for the rule of law. When there were those who would ignore the rule of law and put partisan and personal benefit above the law, eventually they had to account. Some have gotten away, but this country has done a better job of being fair across the board than any other country in history. That's why so many want to come here, because we've had more jobs, a better economy, and made more advancements than any country in history.

Yet, on the issue of immigration, this President stands up and announces we're going to ignore the law, just as he did on marriage. There is a proper law that was signed into law by President Bill Clinton, enacted by Congress, upheld, and he says we're going to ignore that because we don't like it. There goes the rule of law.

When it comes to ObamaCare, we've passed this law. But you know what? So many of the people that pushed this through and rammed it down the throats of America, they're asking for waivers and they're good friends, so we're going to give them waivers so they can ignore the rule of law.

How about the auto bailout? Ignored. The bankruptcy law? It ignored the Constitution and took away dealerships and gave them to others. This was a place where the rule of law was completely ignored.

Then this President stands up and says: Not only are we going to ignore the rule of law, duly passed law, but as I speak, I will create law. I now speak into effect new work visas and work permits that have never existed. But just as the ancient pharaohs or the leaders of the ancient world, as I speak, so it must be. I'm speaking into effect new work permits. I'm speaking into effect an ignoring of the laws that were duly passed. I'm speaking into effect a chance to give them jobs that Americans are hurting and trying to get.

We also have an Attorney General who was not only asked about Fast and Furious, he was asked about Justice Kagan on the Supreme Court: Are you aware of any instances during Justice Kagan's tenure as Solicitor General of the United States in which information related to patient protection and affordable care and/or litigation related thereto was related or provided? He refused to answer.

When did your staff begin removing Solicitor General Kagan from meetings in this matter? On what basis did you take this action? On what other matters was such action taken?

□ 1100

Look, the rule of law required that when it turned out there were possibly thousands of abuses of the national security letter in a Republican administration, I picked up the phone, called the chief of staff of my President, and said, This is unforgivable. We need a new Attorney General. Where is my friend across the aisle who will step up and say, the rule of law is too important?

We have Justice Kagan, who is ignoring law 28 U.S.C. 455 that says, You must disqualify yourself in any case in which your impartiality might reasonably be questioned. It must be reasonably expected that either she ignored the law, did not do her job as Solicitor General, was totally negligent, or she did her job, and she should not have sat on this case. She should have disqualified.

I beg and plead for my colleagues across the aisle to step up, as I did when the Attorney General was responsible for presiding over an injustice, and call for her resignation. It is contemptuous of Congress.

SOME DAYS ARE BETTER THAN OTHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, U2 has a song, "Some Days Are Better Than Others." The lyrics go something like this:

Some days are dry. Some days are leaky. Some days come clean. Other days are sneaky. Some days take less, but most days take more. Some slip through your fingers and onto the floor.

Well, Mr. Speaker, today it is certainly threatening to slip through onto the floor. The House is apparently preparing for an unprecedented floor vote to hold a sitting Attorney General, the Nation's chief law enforcement officer, in contempt. The path that has led us to this sorry day is so long, so bizarre, so tortuous, so fantastical, so unbelievable that it stretches the imagination of individuals to try to make some sense out of our actions.

The Oversight Committee started out investigating the so-called "gun walking" which was initiated under the Bush administration. The Department of Justice produced thousands of pages of documents. The Attorney General testified nine times, and the committee found no wrongdoing by the Attorney General.

So the committee majority turned its attention to a February 4, 2011, letter sent by the Department of Justice to Senator GRASSLEY, initially denying allegations of gun walking. The DOJ acknowledged the errors in the letter

to Senator GRASSLEY and provided more than 1,300 pages of internal documents showing how the letter came to be drafted. The documents demonstrated that the staff did not intentionally mislead Congress but relied on assurances from ATF leaders and officials in Arizona who ran the operation.

Did the committee call the head of the ATF, Ken Melson, to testify as to how this happened, as Democratic members of the committee requested? The answer is no. Did the committee call former Attorney General Mukasey, who was briefed on the botched effort to coordinate arms interdiction with Mexico in 2007? The answer is no.

Instead, the majority members demanded more internal deliberative documents from the Department of Justice after the Grassley letter had been sent. Instead, the committee leadership made an ever-escalating series of allegations regarding the involvement of the White House, documented in YouTube videos and news clips viewed on the Internet, which were subsequently withdrawn. The committee leadership has refused the Attorney General's offer to resolve the conflict.

The President has now claimed executive privilege over a very narrow group of documents from the Department of Justice in response to Chairman ISSA's threat to hold the Attorney General in contempt of Congress. This is the first time the President has claimed executive privilege, in sharp contrast to recent previous Presidents who used the claim on numerous occasions in similar circumstances.

Should the House continue to pursue this irresponsible action, it is likely that it would lead to many years of judicial action and would, of course, further poison the highly charged partisan atmosphere leading up to the elections and critical decisions regarding the Federal budget and all of the other things that we really seriously need to deal with.

So I join with others who are asking the Speaker, who are imploring this House not to take such an irresponsible vote, not to take an irresponsible action, but to sit with the Attorney General, and let's resolve the conflict between the House and the executive branch. That's what reasonable people would do.

DARK MONEY DONORS, SHOW YOURSELVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, money has taken over our political process. Big corporations and high-rolling political schemers tell us everything is still mom and apple pie, and there's nothing to worry about.

But some of us have seen the effects of these hidden million-dollar dark money donations. We've seen the ads that tell you what to think and who to vote for, without telling you who's

talking. We've seen the multimillion-dollar lawsuits that help elite corporate interests, without explaining who's paying the bill. We've seen more and more elections bought and paid for by the only people who can afford it. And those people are not us.

It's time to start naming names and asking why these people won't tell us who they are. We must start to fight back and ask them what they have to hide.

A front group called the National Federation of Independent Business is suing to block the Affordable Care Act. The president of the group says he's doing this to help small businesses. When I and my colleague Representative KEITH ELLISON wrote him a letter, asking him who his members are, he refused to answer. We asked him who gave him several recent million-dollar-plus donations that have helped fund the lawsuit; he refused to answer. We asked him why Karl Rove's Crossroads GPS political group gave him \$3.7 million just when he initiated the lawsuit; he refused to answer. And he thinks that's good enough. Well, it's not.

NFIB has never liked answering questions. In 2006, according to an article in the Nashville Scene, the organization claimed 600,000 member businesses nationwide. Today on its Web site, it claims about 300,000. But when we asked NFIB to disclose where its money comes from, instead of providing us the courtesy of a written response, the group told the press that its membership has been growing by leaps and bounds since the lawsuit began. It described shrinking by 50 percent as big, new expansion, and it said new members had made small donations that covered the cost of this complex lawsuit before the Supreme Court.

In other words, NFIB won't tell us the truth about who it represents or how big it is. What does it have to hide?

Our democracy has always been about people. It's been about individuals and families making choices about who represents their interests. It's about what kind of country we want to live in, not about what kind of country the very wealthy want to choose for us.

Today, as we prepare for the Supreme Court ruling on the Affordable Care Act, millions of Americans with pre-existing health conditions, with sick children, with long-term medical needs, and with no insurance stand together on one side. A front group with bottomless pockets that won't explain its motives sits on the other.

Mr. Speaker, this is not what our democracy is supposed to be about. Our Founding Fathers did not believe wealth makes a man more important than his neighbor. They didn't believe money is more important than the dignity of the individual. They didn't believe that any company or any organization is entitled to a special set of rules. And they certainly didn't believe that an incorporated business entity is the same thing as a human being.

There is no reason we have to accept the choices that the very, very wealthy few in this country are making for the rest of us. Today we stand up to be counted, and we demand that dark money donations come to light; that anyone who wants to influence our democracy step forward and state his name for the record and be honest and transparent with the American people.

□ 1110

Democracy is not for sale, and an election should not be an auction. I'm proud to be on the floor today and say that I am on the side of people that want disclosure, want fair elections, and are tired of the influence of dark money in our collective democracy.

I challenge those front groups to "put up" or "shut up." Tell us who's funding you and what you really want. It's about 4 months and a little more time until America elects a new Congress and a President. Let the voters decide. They know where I stand. And we want these front groups to tell us where they stand, where they get their money, who they are, and who they represent.

The American people in this great democracy of ours should make the choice whether we like it or not. The influence by a very few secretive groups that are fronting for others should not be the ones that decide who represents the American people, who will run this country, and who will set the priorities for this country.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE HOLDER CONTEMPT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this resolution to hold in contempt Attorney General of the United States Mr. Eric Holder. This contempt resolution does no good in moving along the investigation of the gun-walking operations across our borders nor in the investigation of the death of Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry, whose killing was associated with the recovery of two firearms linked with Operation Fast and Furious.

Last year, the House Oversight Committee initiated an investigation into allegations of this operation in the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms and Explosives, or ATF, field division in Arizona. Over the past year, the committee has extended its investigation by requesting thousands of pages of documents from the Department of Justice and interviewing about two dozen officials. In response, the Department has made extraordinary attempts, in my opinion, to accommodate these requests by submitting over almost 8,000 pages of documents. Attorney General Holder has also testified before the committee about nine times on this matter.

But the current contempt debate has lost its focus. This debate is no longer about gun-walking and Operation Fast and Furious. Having already discovered that Fast and Furious was the fourth in a series of gun-walking operations run by ATF's Phoenix field division in Arizona, dating back from the time of former President George W. Bush's administration, and finding no evidence of wrongdoing on the part of the Attorney General, the committee is now turning their focus to a single letter sent by the Department of Justice's Office of Legislative Affairs to Senator GRASSLEY on February 4, 2011, which initially denied allegations of gun-walking.

The Department has acknowledged that its letter was inaccurate and has formally withdrawn the letter. The Department has also turned over 1,300 pages of internal deliberative documents relating to how it was drafted, showing that staffers who drafted the letter relied on inaccurate assurances from ATF leaders and officials in Arizona who ran the operation. Again, the focus has shifted from the real matter of investigation and bringing justice to Agent Brian Terry's family.

During the 16-month investigation, the committee refused all Democratic requests for key witnesses and hearings, as well as requests to interview any Bush administration appointees. For example, the committee refused a public hearing with Ken Melson, the head of ATF, as well as a hearing or even a private meeting with former Attorney General Mukasey.

Attorney General Holder has worked in good faith, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, to respond to the committee's requests and even met with the bipartisan leaders from both Chambers last week, offering to provide additional documents regarding the Fast and Furious initiative. His offer was rejected, and even yet the committee has continue to move the goal posts by demanding additional internal deliberative documents from after the February 4 letter that is now in question.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is the concluding step of what has turned out to be, in my opinion, an unfair process of defaming a public servant who has thus far made all good-faith efforts to cooperate with the Oversight Committee.

Mr. Speaker, to suggest that today's debate and deliberations on this proposed contempt resolution against Attorney General Holder is a profound example of democracy at its best may also be considered a sad day—a sad day for our Nation and a recognition of the fact that there has been a failure of the system to function properly.

I would respectfully urge the Speaker not to bring this resolution to the floor and allow the leadership of both sides of the Oversight Committee not to give up, and continue the dialogue, continue the deliberation, and not to question the motives and integrity of our colleagues on the committee, but solve

the problem that is before us today, Mr. Speaker.

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise to give a special tribute to those fathers and their families who have come to America as refugees, escaping the harsh political and economic conditions in their home countries. On June 20, we celebrated World Refugee Day. Like many of our forefathers, refugees came to America hoping for a better life. Refugees receive sanctuary in the United States because they are in harm's way, they cannot return home safely, and they have nowhere else to turn.

For generations, we have resettled millions of refugees from all over the world. They have come from many backgrounds and ethnicities. America has offered sanctuary to countless Jews, Eastern Europeans, and many others displaced during World War II. We have welcomed people from Cuba, Vietnam, and other Asian countries who were fleeing repressive regimes.

In my home State of Georgia, I have seen how refugees have become an asset, contributing to the local economy and to the local culture. According to data from the Matching Grant Program, on average, 85 percent of refugee families in Georgia are self-sufficient 180 days after arrival.

Many Americans know the remarkable story of the Lost Boys of Sudan. Thousands of Sudanese boys were displaced and separated from their families during the second Sudanese civil war between 1983 and 2005. They traveled by foot for weeks and sometimes years to refugee camps in Ethiopia and Kenya just to survive. Their resilience and hard work should be an example for us all.

Defying all odds, these young men pursued their dream of getting an education in America and grew to become productive members of my congressional district in Scottdale and Clarkston, Georgia. Nonprofit organizations such as Refugee Family Services and RRSIA, located in my district, provide refugees with the resources they need to become self-sufficient and adapt to life here in America.

Thanks to services provided by these organizations, Ram, a young man who grew up in a Nepali refugee camp, was awarded a prestigious Gates Millennium Scholarship, a full 4-year scholarship to any college in the country. Ram chose to remain close to his family in Georgia, and he is attending Georgia Tech and plans to become a doctor.

So as we celebrate and recognize World Refugee Day this month, let us take a moment to think of those refugees, and let us recognize those organizations and volunteers working tirelessly every day helping refugees build

a better future for generations to come. Let us also be proud as Americans for following our age-old tradition of welcoming those who have lost almost everything, but have found in our great country a promise for a better tomorrow.

□ 1120

Moreover, let us celebrate the generosity of the American people who have granted to refugees the best gift of all—freedom and hope.

So I ask all of my colleagues not to cut funding for refugees just to score cheap political points. Let us instead embrace refugees. Except for Native Americans, we are all descendants of progenitors who came here under some form of duress. Let us uphold our better nature of compassion and kindness that lies at the heart of who we are as Americans.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the energy and tensions of the Second Session gather, may there be peace among the Members of the people's House. Grant that all might be confident in the mission they have been given and buoyed by the spirit of our ancestors who built our Republic through many trials and contentious debates. May all strive with noble sincerity for the betterment of our Nation.

Many centuries ago, You blessed Abraham for his welcome to strangers by the oaks of Mamre. Bless this Chamber this day with the same spirit of hospitality, so that all Americans might know that in the people's House all voices are respected, even those with whom there is disagreement.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

OUR NATION IS ANXIOUSLY
AWAITING DECISION ON
OBAMACARE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Americans will find out what we've been anxiously awaiting for the past 2 years: whether or not the government health care takeover bill is constitutional. Tomorrow, at 10 a.m., people across the Nation will be closely watching and listening as the Supreme Court delivers its opinion.

In efforts to rally her party for ObamaCare, former House Speaker NANCY PELOSI outraged Americans at a press conference by stating, "We have to pass the bill so we can find out what's in it." The American people now know this bill, and they overwhelmingly disapprove of this bill, which the National Federation of Independent Business reveals will destroy 1.6 million jobs.

It is my hope that the Supreme Court will side with the best interests of the American people and overturn the job-destroying, out-of-control spending, and overreaching government health care takeover bill, which will hurt senior citizens with waiting lists, rationing, and denial of service.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Congratulations, Tom Rice of Myrtle Beach.

OPPOSING CONTEMPT CITATION
AGAINST THE HONORABLE ERIC
H. HOLDER, JR., ATTORNEY GEN-
ERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, tomorrow we risk bringing dishonor to this House.

For Members who revere Congress as the legislative branch of government, the majority's irresponsible and unprecedented contempt vote is just another sad chapter in our recent institu-

tional decline. I implore my colleagues to give careful consideration as to whether we truly want the 112th Congress to become the first in history to hold a sitting Cabinet member in contempt of Congress.

Do we really want our legacy to be establishing one of the most partisan House of Representatives of all time, so clouded in judgment, so besotted with rancor and partisanship, that we are incapable of addressing vital separation of powers conflicts in a serious and fair fashion?

Further negotiations with the Department of Justice and the Attorney General are clearly available if we want a solution. I urge my colleagues to join me in restoring honor and dignity to this House by opposing the nuclear option: a contempt citation.

SMALL BUSINESS LENDING FOR
JOBS ACT OF 2012

(Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. An important part of the continued viability of our Nation's small businesses is their access to capital. To foster this access, we need to provide community financial institutions with responsible regulatory relief so they can increase lending to small businesses.

That is why, today, I have introduced the Small Business Lending for Jobs Act of 2012. This bipartisan legislation will allow community banks to spread losses in commercial real estate over a 7-year period. This will allow banks to retain more capital and use these funds to make new loans to small businesses in their communities.

The bill also establishes a dual mission for Federal banking regulators and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, mandating these entities promote credit availability so long as that credit is provided in a safe and sound manner. This will bring a greater balance to banking regulations. A dual mission will lead to regulators factoring in the impact on banks, communities, and customers in making their decision.

I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan Small Business Lending for Jobs Act of 2012.

AMERICA'S CUP

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work being done in my home State of Rhode Island as we host the final leg of the inaugural America's Cup World Series, an incredible boost to our tourism economy and a great moment for our State.

Teams of competitors and spectators from around the world have come to Newport for the America's Cup World Series, which according to some esti-

mates is expected to bring in \$70 million for our State's economy.

Although Newport hosted the America's Cup from 1930 to 1983, this marks the first time in history that America's Cup races are actually being held inside Narragansett Bay.

The opportunity to host a leg of this year's America's Cup not only provides a source of real economic benefit for our State, but also an intangible level of pride for all Rhode Islanders.

Thank you to the organizers for their hard work. I wish the competitors good luck, and to all those likely to benefit from the enormous economic impact of these events, much success.

BAXTER BOMB SQUAD
RECOGNITION

(Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the members of the Mountain Home High School FIRST Robotics team, first known as the "Baxter Bomb Squad," who recently won the For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology championship. The team was made up of 22 students and 14 adults, including several pairs of father-and-son teams.

Together they spent hundreds of hours building a robot, which competed in the Rebound Rumble, a basketball-inspired game. The team competed in front of an audience of 30,000 people and against more than 400 other teams.

The Baxter Bomb Squad has been competing for 17 years, and for the very first time this year, they won the championship. They were sponsored by local businesses, including Baxter Healthcare and Mountain Home High School.

The For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology championship has helped influence thousands of students throughout the country to pursue higher education in engineering and related scientific fields. Students who participated in this competition are 50 percent more likely to attend college and twice as likely to major in science and engineering.

Congratulations to the Baxter Bomb Squad. Best of luck for years to come.

ORAL CHEMOTHERAPY

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, every day more and more cancer patients across the country are denied coverage for smart drugs because insurance companies refuse to cover them.

A resident in my district called my office last month to say that her insurance company refused to cover an oral chemotherapy drug she was prescribed to fight her cancer because her policy only covered generic drugs.

Madam Speaker, the insurance paradigm has not kept pace with the

science, and this is unacceptable. That is why I have introduced H.R. 2746, the Cancer Drug Coverage Parity Act, to mandate parity in coverage for all forms of chemotherapy, whether they're administered orally or through the vein.

I urge colleagues to support this legislation because cancer treatment should be determined by a physician, not by arbitrary and outdated insurance policies.

□ 1210

REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BROUN of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, more than 2 years ago, the President signed into law one of the most egregious attacks upon our freedom that this Nation has ever seen. Two years later, almost 60 percent of the American people still want to see ObamaCare repealed before the price of their health care goes up even more than it already has. Believe me, if we let this law take effect as planned, costs will skyrocket, and millions of Americans will lose their insurance altogether.

On top of restrictive mandates, higher taxes, Medicare cuts, and more government overreach, ObamaCare is flat out unconstitutional. We simply cannot force the American people to buy health insurance if they don't want it. I'm hopeful that tomorrow the Supreme Court will do its job and apply the Constitution as our Founding Fathers intended.

I look forward to repealing ObamaCare and getting started on real health care reform, as soon as the court reaches a decision.

POLITICAL VENDETTA

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, with so few days left in this legislative session, this is a time when we could be talking about how to help create jobs, improve education, and lower the deficit. That is surely what the American people really care about.

Instead, the greatest deliberative body in the world is quarreling about bringing a contempt charge to the floor of Congress against the Attorney General. It has never happened before. And let's be clear: it's not about finding the truth or creating reforms or finding out how gun walking started. We know how that started—it started under the Bush administration.

What this is about is just the Republican leadership pursuing single-mindedly a political vendetta, a political obsession. Like Ahab going after the great white whale, they are hoping to spill political blood.

This is the type of gamesmanship and partisanship that understandably makes the American people lose faith in their Congress and in their leaders.

Tomorrow, if it comes to the floor, vote "no" and let's get back to work on the real problems.

A FAST AND FURIOUS ATTACK

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, tomorrow the House is intending to vote on the contempt of our outstanding Attorney General, Eric Holder. It's because the Republicans have been obsessed with Fast and Furious.

Fast and Furious was a plan that went awry. It was started by the Bush administration, and it went awry. It was fatally flawed, and it resulted in the tragic death of a border agent. But nothing in this resolution will get to the bottom of it, and nothing will change it.

The fact is Fast and Furious is misnamed. Fast and furious is what the Republicans—starting with Senator MITCH MCCONNELL—have been doing since President Obama was elected. In a fast and furious way they've tried to do everything they can to taint the President of the United States and to taint anybody associated with him. That's what they are doing with Eric Holder. They want to blemish him and blemish the President.

Their fast and furious attack on the health care bill, which will save lives in America, and on this administration, is shameless. We should be creating jobs, helping the middle class, and putting America on the road to recovery. Instead, what we've been doing is a fast and furious attack on this administration.

A POLITICAL WITCH HUNT

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, while we have decried bullying in our schools, unfortunately it's going on right here in this House.

Tomorrow, the Issa resolution holding our Attorney General in contempt is to come to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to put an end to this totally politically inspired attack on Attorney General Holder and President Obama's administration.

Thousands of documents have been produced, many interviews have been held, and Mr. Holder has testified before Congress nine times on the operation Fast and Furious, which was started in Arizona no less, and under President Bush's administration. Democrats were not allowed one witness or a hearing that would have made this a fair, balanced, and likely closed investigation.

At the end of this extreme, unprecedented, partisan attack on the current

administration, which is what it's all about and what can only be called a political witch hunt, what you will find in Attorney General Eric Holder is an intelligent, competent, patriotic, dedicated, and humble public servant who is upholding the integrity of his office and serving this country with honor.

Madam Speaker, I urge the House not to sully the history and decorum of this body with this first-ever vote to hold a sitting Attorney General in contempt.

SHAMEFUL

(Mr. CLAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, tomorrow this House is about to do something unprecedented and unwarranted. Motivated solely by politics, the leadership of this House is planning to smear a dedicated public servant.

For the first time in our history, they are planning to hold the Attorney General of the United States in contempt of Congress. This is shameful. Not even during the nakedly partisan speakership of Newt Gingrich has this House even considered such a resolution. But even more shameful is that they are ignoring the real issue, the easily available assault weapons and the gun related violence that continues unabated in this country.

Madam Speaker, they need to put aside politics and start caring about the safety of all of our citizens.

INVEST IN JOBS AND OUR INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mr. HIMES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, I live in the Village of Cos Cob, Connecticut, where years ago a major bridge spanning the Mianus Harbor on Route 95 fell into the Mianus Harbor, killing a number of people, devastating the quality of life in the area, and hurting businesses up and down the coastline.

It fell into Mianus Harbor because we failed to invest in our transportation infrastructure. We failed to do something that we all understand is critical to our economy and just plain good sense.

On June 30, thousands of projects—like keeping the Mianus Harbor Bridge intact—will come to a halt because this House will not approve a reauthorization of the transportation bill. That's bad economics. It's bad for jobs, and it's bad for safety.

What do we do? Seventy-four Senators, lots of Republicans, and lots of Democrats, passed a 2-year bill that would keep the funding going and preserve or save or create 2 million jobs. But not in this House. No. In this House we've got to get the President to approve Keystone. We should do that, but let's do it separately and invest in jobs and our infrastructure.

RECOGNIZING THE VALUE OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, tomorrow the United States Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act.

Let us all step back and recognize those portions that people like. These are the highlights: For seniors, it closes the infamous doughnut hole for prescription drugs. This means, to date, about 5.3 million seniors have experienced savings of \$3.7 billion. That doughnut hole will close completely by the year 2020.

For women, we no longer are going to suffer the discrimination against us. Ninety percent of the plans today charge more for women than they do for men for the same process. In 2014, this stops. Women can no longer be discriminated against for what they call preexisting conditions. Do you know what these preexisting conditions are? Breast cancer, C-section and childbirth, pregnancy, victims of domestic abuse.

And there will be a ban on maximum coverage in your lifetime for medical care. You will no longer need to have a referral to go see an OB/GYN. Children will also benefit.

Madam Speaker, let's all recognize the value of the Affordable Care Act.

WE HAVE TO PUT OUR HEADS TOGETHER

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, if you know you're approaching a cliff, wouldn't you take steps to avoid it?

Consumer confidence is flagging. It's flagging in part because some Members of the House have taken to brandishing the debt ceiling as a weapon designed to undercut economic growth. That just isn't responsible.

We have to put our heads together now to find a responsible way to cut spending and increase revenues rather than play the blame game. We cannot allow this year's approaching fiscal crisis to go the way of the budget supercommittee. That means both parties must find common ground. I know that's what San Diegans expect.

It is critical that we deal with our real problems. Those who are underemployed need jobs, doctors facing reimbursement cuts must be paid, and everything cannot be paid for on the backs of the middle class.

□ 1220

WELCOMING HIS HOLINESS,
HAZRAT MIRZA MASROOR
AHMAD TO THE CAPITOL

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor today to welcome to the House of Representatives His Holiness, Hazrat Mirza Masroor Ahmad. He is with us today in the gallery. His Holiness is the worldwide spiritual leader of the Ahmadiyya Muslim community, which has tens of millions of adherents around the world in 190 countries and tens of thousands of adherents here in the United States.

Today at a historic event in the Gold Room of the Rayburn Building, we recognized His Holiness' commitment to world peace, to brotherhood, to justice, and to religious freedom. I am proud to join with my colleague from California, ZOE LOFGREN, and others in introducing a resolution today in honor of His Holiness' visit here to our Nation's Capitol. In the United States, the Ahmadi community is one of the oldest and most organized Islamic communities.

I also want to take this opportunity to recognize two distinguished leaders from Los Angeles, Dr. Asif Mahmood and Kareem Ahmed, who are also in the gallery here and who show such leadership of the Muslim community in the Los Angeles area.

It is my honor to recognize His Holiness, to invite him to be with us here in the people's House. And I want to commend the Ahmadi motto: "Love for all. Hatred for none."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). Members should not refer to occupants of the gallery. In addition, the Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of its proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

CAP STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

(Mr. CLARKE of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I will say to the American people, to the over 1 million online supporters of my legislation to forgive student loans, I want to thank you all for creating a national movement, a movement so strong that we are now demanding that this House and this Congress do something to cap student loan interest rates. But we can't give up. We can't stop there. We've got to cut this debt to bring people hope and to create jobs.

NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, every year, California dairies produce over 17

billion pounds of milk products that provide families with affordable, nutrient-rich products that we consume. California is the Nation's top milk-producing State, and much of the production takes place in the San Joaquin Valley, which I represent a part of. Many of these dairies in my district have been passed down from generation to generation, including the one that I grew up on in Kearney Park, near Fresno, California.

Over the last few years, dairy producers have seen milk prices continue to drop and feed prices increase and even skyrocket. In the coming weeks, the Ag Committee is slated to begin consideration of the 2012 farm bill. It is my hope that we can find a way to bring more certainty in prices and prevent extreme market volatility to help our producers across the country stay afloat.

As National Dairy Month comes to a close, I would like to commend our dairymen and -women for the work they do every day on the farm, 365 days a year, that allows families nationwide to enjoy the nutritious, cost-effective food that they are putting on our tables.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MUNICH VICTIMS

(Mr. ISRAEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, several weeks ago, my friend from New York, Congressman HANNA, and I sent a bipartisan letter to the International Olympic Committee, asking them to hold a moment of silence during the opening ceremonies of this year's Olympic Games in commemoration of the victims of the 1972 Munich massacre.

On September 5, 1972, 2 weeks after the start of the Olympic games in Munich, members of a Palestinian terrorist group, Black September, broke into the Olympic Village. Eleven Israelis were killed in that massacre. Now, 40 years later, in London, we are convening another Olympic ceremony. We asked the International Olympic Committee to recognize this 40-year anniversary, and the response we got was, No.

That is the wrong response, Madam Speaker. We, again, on a bipartisan basis, appealed to the International Olympic Committee in London, when these Olympics begin, to commemorate those Israelis who were massacred, which fits the ideals of the Olympics and, that is, international friendship and fraternity.

Eleven lives were lost. We should remember them in London when the Olympics convene.

STOP STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES FROM DOUBLING

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, today I rise to draw attention to the fact that there are only 4 days left until Federal student loan interest rates double. On July 1, the interest rate for 7 million students could rise to 6.8 percent. Failure to act and to act now would add \$6.3 billion to students' debt burdens in 1 year alone.

Frankly, Madam Speaker, this rise in rates would happen at a time when our young people can least afford it. Our young people who are recent college graduates have the highest unemployment rate of any age group in the Nation, and more of them are graduating with debt than ever before. In fact, two-thirds of the class of 2010 graduated with student loan debt.

Madam Speaker, this is a real problem. It should be solved now, and it shouldn't be solved on the backs of the working class and the poor. I urge my colleagues to join me and do the right thing. Let's stop the interest rates from doubling before it's too late.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS' BENEFITS IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 4018) to improve the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5972 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 697 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5972.

Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1228

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, June 26, 2012, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROWN) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 74, line 6.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I submit the following for the RECORD.

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses.....	102,481	110,450	108,277	+5,796	-2,173
Immediate Office of the Secretary.....	(2,618)	---	(2,635)	(+17)	(+2,635)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary.....	(984)	---	(992)	(+8)	(+992)
Office of the General Counsel.....	(19,515)	---	(19,615)	(+100)	(+19,615)
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.....	(10,107)	---	(11,248)	(+1,141)	(+11,248)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs.....	(10,538)	---	(12,825)	(+2,287)	(+12,825)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs.....	(2,500)	---	(2,601)	(+101)	(+2,601)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	(25,469)	---	(27,095)	(+1,626)	(+27,095)
Office of Public Affairs.....	(2,020)	---	(2,034)	(+14)	(+2,034)
Office of the Executive Secretariat.....	(1,595)	---	(1,701)	(+106)	(+1,701)
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization.....	(1,369)	---	(1,539)	(+170)	(+1,539)
Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response.....	(10,778)	---	(10,875)	(+97)	(+10,875)
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	(14,988)	---	(15,117)	(+129)	(+15,117)
Research and Development.....	---	13,670	---	---	-13,670
National Infrastructure Investments.....	500,000	500,000	---	-500,000	-500,000
Livable Communities Initiative.....	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Financial Management Capital.....	4,990	10,000	10,000	+5,010	---
Cyber Security Initiatives.....	10,000	6,000	6,000	-4,000	---
Office of Civil Rights.....	9,384	9,773	9,773	+389	---
Transportation Planning, Research, and Development....	9,000	10,000	8,000	-1,000	-2,000
Working Capital Fund.....	(172,000)	---	(174,128)	(+2,128)	(+174,128)
Minority Business Resource Center Program.....	922	1,285	1,285	+363	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(18,367)	(21,955)	(21,955)	(+3,588)	---
Minority Business Outreach.....	3,068	3,234	3,234	+166	---
Payments to Air Carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	143,000	114,000	114,000	-29,000	---
Rescission of excess compensation for general aviation operations.....	-3,254	---	---	+3,254	---
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	779,591	783,412	260,569	-519,022	-522,843
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations.....	9,653,395	9,718,000	9,718,000	+64,605	---
Air traffic organization.....	(7,442,738)	---	(7,513,850)	(+71,112)	(+7,513,850)
Aviation safety.....	(1,252,991)	---	(1,255,000)	(+2,009)	(+1,255,000)
Commercial space transportation.....	(16,271)	---	(16,700)	(+429)	(+16,700)
Finance and management.....	(582,117)	---	(573,591)	(-8,526)	(+573,591)
Human resources programs.....	(98,858)	---	---	(-98,858)	---
Staff offices.....	(200,286)	---	(298,795)	(+98,509)	(+298,795)
NextGen.....	(60,134)	---	(60,064)	(-70)	(+60,064)
Facilities and Equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	2,730,731	2,850,000	2,749,596	+18,865	-100,404
Research, Engineering, and Development (Airport & Airway Trust Fund).....	167,556	180,000	175,000	+7,444	-5,000
Rescission.....	---	-26,184	-26,184	-26,184	---
Subtotal.....	167,556	153,816	148,816	-18,740	-5,000
Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(3,435,000)	(3,400,000)	(3,400,000)	(-35,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(3,350,000)	(3,350,000)	(3,350,000)	---	---
Administration.....	(101,000)	(103,000)	(105,000)	(+4,000)	(+2,000)
Airport Cooperative Research Program.....	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	---	---
Airport technology research.....	(29,250)	(29,300)	(29,300)	(+50)	---
Small community air service development program....	(6,000)	---	---	(-6,000)	---
Chapter 471 reform obligation limitation reduction (legislative proposal).....	---	(-926,000)	---	---	(+926,000)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Aviation Insurance Revolving Fund (Sec. 117).....	---	-1,000	---	---	+1,000
Total, Federal Aviation Administration.....	12,551,682	12,720,816	12,616,412	+64,730	-104,404
Appropriations.....	(12,551,682)	(12,747,000)	(12,642,596)	(+90,914)	(-104,404)
Rescissions.....	---	(-26,184)	(-26,184)	(-26,184)	---
Limitations on obligations.....	(3,350,000)	(2,424,000)	(3,350,000)	---	(+926,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(15,901,682)	(15,144,816)	(15,966,412)	(+64,730)	(+821,596)
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on Administrative Expenses.....	(412,000)	(437,780)	(392,855)	(-19,145)	(-44,925)
Federal-Aid Highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(39,882,583)	(42,569,000)	(39,882,583)	---	(-2,686,417)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(39,143,583)	(41,830,000)	(39,143,583)	---	(-2,686,417)
(Exempt contract authority).....	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Emergency Relief (disaster relief category).....	1,662,000	---	---	-1,662,000	---
Total, Federal Highway Administration.....	1,662,000	---	---	-1,662,000	---
Disaster relief category.....	(1,662,000)	---	---	(-1,662,000)	---
Limitations on obligations.....	(39,143,583)	(41,830,000)	(39,143,583)	---	(-2,686,417)
Exempt contract authority.....	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Total budgetary resources.....	(41,544,583)	(42,569,000)	(39,882,583)	(-1,662,000)	(-2,686,417)
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration					
Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs (Highway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)..	(247,724)	(250,000)	(244,144)	(-3,580)	(-5,856)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(247,724)	(250,000)	(244,144)	(-3,580)	(-5,856)
Motor Carrier Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(307,000)	(330,000)	(307,000)	---	(-23,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(307,000)	(330,000)	(307,000)	---	(-23,000)
CVISN contract authority (Sec. 131).....	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
Rescission of contract authority.....	-1,000	---	---	+1,000	---
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.....	---	---	---	---	---
Limitations on obligations.....	(554,724)	(580,000)	(551,144)	(-3,580)	(-28,856)
Total budgetary resources.....	(554,724)	(580,000)	(551,144)	(-3,580)	(-28,856)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and Research (general fund).....	140,146	---	152,000	+11,854	+152,000
Vehicle Safety.....	---	188,000	---	---	-188,000
Operations and Research (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(109,500)	(150,000)	(122,360)	(+12,860)	(-27,640)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(109,500)	---	(122,360)	(+12,860)	(+122,360)
Highway Safety Research and Development					
(Limitation on obligations).....	---	(150,000)	---	---	(-150,000)
Subtotal.....	249,646	338,000	274,360	+24,714	-63,640
Highway Traffic Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(550,328)	(643,000)	(501,828)	(-48,500)	(-141,172)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(550,328)	(643,000)	(501,828)	(-48,500)	(-141,172)
Highway safety programs (23 USC 402).....	(235,000)	(317,500)	(235,000)	---	(-82,500)
Occupant protection incentive grants(23 USC 405)	(25,000)	(40,000)	(25,000)	---	(-15,000)
Safety belt performance grants (23 USC 406).....	(48,500)	---	---	(-48,500)	---
Distracted driving prevention.....	---	(50,000)	---	---	(-50,000)
State traffic safety information system					
improvement(23 USC 408).....	(34,500)	(34,500)	(34,500)	---	---
Impaired driving countermeasures (23 USC 410)...	(139,000)	(139,000)	(139,000)	---	---
Grant administration.....	(25,328)	(18,000)	(25,328)	---	(+7,328)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
High visibility enforcement.....	(29,000)	(37,000)	(29,000)	---	(-8,000)
Child safety and booster seat grants.....	(7,000)	---	(7,000)	---	(+7,000)
Motorcyclist safety.....	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	---	---
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.....	140,146	188,000	152,000	+11,854	-36,000
Limitations on obligations.....	(659,828)	(793,000)	(624,188)	(-35,640)	(-168,812)
Total budgetary resources.....	(799,974)	(981,000)	(776,188)	(-23,786)	(-204,812)
Federal Railroad Administration					
Safety and Operations.....	178,596	196,000	184,000	+5,404	-12,000
Offsetting fee collections (legislative proposal).....	---	-40,000	---	---	+40,000
Direct appropriation.....	178,596	156,000	184,000	+5,404	+28,000
Railroad Research and Development.....	35,000	35,500	35,500	+500	---
System Preservation.....	---	1,546,000	---	---	-1,546,000
Network Development.....	---	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000
National Railroad Passenger Corporation:					
Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.....	466,000	---	350,000	-116,000	+350,000
Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.....	952,000	---	1,452,000	+500,000	+1,452,000
Subtotal.....	1,418,000	---	1,802,000	+384,000	+1,802,000
Next Gen High Speed Rail Service (rescission).....	---	-1,973	-1,973	-1,973	---
Northeast Corridor Improvement Program (rescission)....	---	-4,419	-4,419	-4,419	---
Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....	1,631,596	2,731,108	2,015,108	+383,512	-716,000
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative Expenses.....	98,713	---	100,000	+1,287	+100,000
Formula and Bus Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(9,400,000)	---	(9,400,000)	---	(+9,400,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(8,360,565)	---	(8,360,565)	---	(+8,360,565)
Rescission of prior year contract authority.....	---	-72,496	-72,496	-72,496	---
Research and Technology Deployment.....	---	120,957	---	---	-120,957
Transit Formula Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	---	(9,500,000)	---	---	(-9,500,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	---	(4,759,372)	---	---	(-4,759,372)
Transit Expansion and Livable Communities (liquidation of contract authorization).....	---	(1,500,000)	---	---	(-1,500,000)
(limitation on obligations).....	---	(212,185)	---	---	(-212,185)
Capital Investment Grants.....	---	2,235,486	---	---	-2,235,486
Operations and Safety.....	---	166,000	---	---	-166,000
Administrative programs.....	---	(129,700)	---	---	(-129,700)
Rail transit safety programs.....	---	(36,300)	---	---	(-36,300)
Research and University Research Centers.....	44,000	---	44,000	---	+44,000
Bus and Rail State of Good Repair (liquidation of contract authorization).....	---	(1,500,000)	---	---	(-1,500,000)
(limitation on obligations).....	---	(3,207,000)	---	---	(-3,207,000)
Capital Investment Grants.....	1,955,000	---	1,816,993	-138,007	+1,816,993
Rescission.....	-58,500	-11,429	-11,429	+47,071	---
Subtotal.....	1,896,500	-11,429	1,805,564	-90,936	+1,816,993

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority					
Capital and Preventive Maintenance.....	150,000	135,000	150,000	---	+15,000
Rescission.....	---	-523	-523	-523	---
Subtotal.....	150,000	134,477	149,477	-523	+15,000
University Transportation Research (rescission).....	---	-293	-293	-293	---
Job Access and Reverse Commute Grants (rescission)....	---	-14,662	-14,662	-14,662	---
Research, Training and Human Resources (rescission)...	---	-248	-248	-248	---
Interstate Transfer Grants (rescission).....	---	-2,662	-2,662	-2,662	---
Urban discretionary accounts (rescission).....	---	-578	-578	-578	---
Total, Federal Transit Administration.....	2,189,213	2,554,552	2,008,102	-181,111	-546,450
Appropriations.....	(2,247,713)	(2,657,443)	(2,110,993)	(-136,720)	(-546,450)
Rescissions.....	(-58,500)	(-30,395)	(-30,395)	(+28,105)	---
Limitations on obligations.....	(8,360,565)	(8,178,557)	(8,360,565)	---	(+182,008)
Total budgetary resources.....	(10,549,778)	(10,733,109)	(10,368,667)	(-181,111)	(-364,442)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and Maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund).....	32,259	33,000	33,000	+741	---
Maritime Administration					
Maritime Security Program.....	174,000	184,000	184,000	+10,000	---
Operations and Training.....	156,258	146,298	145,753	-10,505	-545
Rescission.....	-980	---	---	+980	---
Ship Disposal.....	5,500	10,000	4,000	-1,500	-6,000
Assistance to Small Shipyards.....	9,980	---	---	-9,980	---
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account:					
Administrative expenses.....	3,740	3,750	3,750	+10	---
Rescission.....	-35,000	---	---	+35,000	---
Subtotal.....	-31,260	3,750	3,750	+35,010	---
Total, Maritime Administration.....	313,498	344,048	337,503	+24,005	-6,545
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration					
Operational Expenses:					
General Fund.....	20,721	20,408	22,391	+1,670	+1,983
Pipeline Safety Fund.....	639	639	639	---	---
Pipeline Safety information grants to communities.....	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,500)	(+500)	(+500)
Subtotal.....	21,360	21,047	23,030	+1,670	+1,983
Hazardous Materials Safety.....	42,338	50,673	42,546	+208	-8,127
Pipeline Safety:					
Pipeline Safety Fund.....	90,679	150,500	90,679	---	-59,821
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.....	18,573	21,510	18,573	---	-2,937
Pipeline Safety Design Review Fund (leg. proposal).....	---	4,000	2,000	+2,000	-2,000
Subtotal.....	109,252	176,010	111,252	+2,000	-64,758
Subtotal, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.....	172,950	247,730	176,828	+3,878	-70,902
Pipeline safety user fees.....	-91,318	-151,139	-91,318	---	+59,821
Special permit and approval fees (leg. proposal).....	---	-12,000	---	---	+12,000
Pipeline Safety Design Review fee (leg. proposal).....	---	-4,000	-2,000	-2,000	+2,000

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Emergency Preparedness Grants:					
Limitation on emergency preparedness fund.....	(28,318)	(28,318)	(28,318)	---	---
(Emergency preparedness fund).....	(188)	(188)	(188)	---	---
Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.....					
	81,632	80,591	83,510	+1,878	+2,919
Research and Innovative Technology Administration					
Research and Development.....	15,981	---	13,500	-2,481	+13,500
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and Expenses.....	79,624	84,499	84,499	+4,875	---
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and Expenses.....	29,310	31,250	31,250	+1,940	---
Offsetting collections.....	-1,250	-1,250	-1,250	---	---
Total, Surface Transportation Board.....					
	28,060	30,000	30,000	+1,940	---
=====					
Total, title I, Department of Transportation..	19,505,282	19,550,026	17,634,203	-1,871,079	-1,915,823
Appropriations.....	(17,942,016)	(19,685,493)	(17,769,670)	(-172,346)	(-1,915,823)
Rescissions.....	(-97,734)	(-62,971)	(-62,971)	(+34,763)	---
Disaster relief category.....	(1,662,000)	---	---	(-1,662,000)	---
Rescissions of contract authority.....	(-1,000)	(-72,496)	(-72,496)	(-71,496)	---
Limitations on obligations.....	(52,068,700)	(53,805,557)	(52,029,480)	(-39,220)	(-1,776,077)
Total budgetary resources.....					
	(71,573,982)	(73,355,583)	(69,663,683)	(-1,910,299)	(-3,691,900)
=====					
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Management and Administration					
Administration, Operations and Management.....	537,789	532,546	518,068	-19,721	-14,478
Program Office Salaries and Expenses:					
Public and Indian Housing.....	200,000	211,634	206,500	+6,500	-5,134
Community Planning and Development.....	100,000	103,882	103,500	+3,500	-382
Housing.....	391,500	398,832	396,500	+5,000	-2,332
Policy Development and Research.....	22,211	21,394	22,326	+115	+932
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.....	72,600	74,296	72,904	+304	-1,392
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control...	7,400	6,816	6,816	-584	---
Subtotal.....					
	793,711	816,854	808,546	+14,835	-8,308
Total, Management and Administration.....					
	1,331,500	1,349,400	1,326,614	-4,886	-22,786
Public and Indian Housing					
Tenant-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals.....	17,242,351	17,237,948	17,237,948	-4,403	---
Tenant protection vouchers.....	75,000	75,000	75,000	---	---
Administrative fees.....	1,350,000	1,575,000	1,575,000	+225,000	---
Family self-sufficiency coordinators.....	60,000	---	60,000	---	+60,000
Veterans affairs supportive housing.....	75,000	75,000	75,000	---	---
Sec. 811 mainstream voucher renewals.....	112,018	111,335	111,335	-683	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-25,000)	---	---	(+25,000)
Subtotal (available this fiscal year).....					
	18,914,369	19,074,283	19,134,283	+219,914	+60,000

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Advance appropriations.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances.....	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	---	---
Total, Tenant-based Rental Assistance appropriated in this bill.....	18,914,369	19,074,283	19,134,283	+219,914	+60,000
Public Housing Capital Fund.....	1,875,000	2,070,000	1,985,000	+110,000	-85,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-10,350)	---	---	(+10,350)
Public Housing Operating Fund.....	3,961,850	4,524,000	4,524,000	+562,150	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-22,620)	---	---	(+22,620)
Choice neighborhoods.....	120,000	150,000	---	-120,000	-150,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-750)	---	---	(+750)
Family Self-Sufficiency.....	---	60,000	---	---	-60,000
Native American Housing Block Grants.....	650,000	650,000	650,000	---	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-3,250)	---	---	(+3,250)
Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant.....	13,000	13,000	---	-13,000	-13,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-65)	---	---	(+65)
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account....	6,000	7,000	6,000	---	-1,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(360,000)	(900,000)	---	(-360,000)	(-900,000)
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-35)	---	---	(+35)
Native Hawaiian Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account....	386	1,000	---	-386	-1,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(41,504)	(107,000)	---	(-41,504)	(-107,000)
Housing Certificate Fund (rescission).....	-200,000	---	---	+200,000	---
Total, Public and Indian Housing.....	25,340,605	26,549,283	26,299,283	+958,678	-250,000
Community Planning and Development					
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS.....	332,000	330,000	330,000	-2,000	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,650)	---	---	(+1,650)
Community Development Fund.....	2,948,090	2,948,090	3,404,000	+455,910	+455,910
Indian CDBG.....	60,000	60,000	---	-60,000	-60,000
Sustainable housing and communities.....	---	100,000	---	---	-100,000
Capacity building.....	---	35,000	---	---	-35,000
Disaster relief.....	300,000	---	---	-300,000	---
(Disaster relief category).....	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
Subtotal.....	3,408,090	3,143,090	3,404,000	-4,090	+260,910
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-15,715)	---	---	(+15,715)
Community Development Loan Guarantees (Section 108):					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(240,000)	(500,000)	---	(-240,000)	(-500,000)
Credit subsidy.....	5,952	---	6,000	+48	+6,000
HOME Investment Partnerships Program.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,200,000	+200,000	+200,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-5,000)	---	---	(+5,000)
Self-help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program.....	53,500	---	60,000	+6,500	+60,000
Homeless Assistance Grants.....	1,901,190	2,231,000	2,000,000	+98,810	-231,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-11,155)	---	---	(+11,155)
Total, Community Planning and Development.....	6,700,732	6,704,090	7,000,000	+299,268	+295,910
Housing Programs					
Project-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals.....	9,050,672	8,440,400	8,440,400	-610,272	---
Contract administrators.....	289,000	260,000	260,000	-29,000	---
Subtotal (available this fiscal year).....	9,339,672	8,700,400	8,700,400	-639,272	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-19,000)	---	---	(+19,000)
Advance appropriations.....	400,000	400,000	400,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances.....	-400,000	-400,000	-400,000	---	---
Total, Project-based rental assistance appropriated in this bill.....	9,339,672	8,700,400	8,700,400	-639,272	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Housing for the Elderly.....	374,627	475,000	425,000	+50,373	-50,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-2,375)	---	---	(+2,375)
Housing for Persons with Disabilities.....	165,000	150,000	165,000	---	+15,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-750)	---	---	(+750)
Housing Counseling Assistance.....	45,000	55,000	45,000	---	-10,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-275)	---	---	(+275)
Rental Housing Assistance.....	1,300	---	---	-1,300	---
Rent Supplement (rescission).....	-231,600	---	---	+231,600	---
Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund.....	6,500	8,000	4,000	-2,500	-4,000
Offsetting collections.....	-4,000	-4,000	-4,000	---	---
Subtotal.....	2,500	4,000	---	-2,500	-4,000
Total, Housing Programs.....	9,696,499	9,384,400	9,335,400	-361,099	-49,000
Appropriations.....	(9,932,099)	(9,388,400)	(9,339,400)	(-592,699)	(-49,000)
Rescissions.....	(-231,600)	---	---	(+231,600)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	---	---
Federal Housing Administration					
Mutual Mortgage Insurance Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-4,427,000	-9,676,000	-9,676,000	-5,249,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM) (Sec. 210).....	-286,000	-170,000	-170,000	+116,000	---
Additional offsetting receipts (Sec. 238).....	-59,000	---	---	+59,000	---
Administrative contract expenses.....	207,000	215,000	215,000	+8,000	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,075)	---	---	(+1,075)
Working capital fund (transfer out).....	(-71,500)	(-71,500)	(-71,500)	---	---
General and Special Risk Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-400,000	-588,000	-588,000	-188,000	---
Total, Federal Housing Administration.....	-4,965,000	-10,219,000	-10,219,000	-5,254,000	---
Government National Mortgage Association					
Guarantees of Mortgage-backed Securities Loan					
Guarantee Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses (legislative proposal).....	19,500	21,000	20,500	+1,000	-500
Offsetting receipts (legislative proposal).....	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-521,000	-647,000	-647,000	-126,000	---
Offsetting receipts (Sec. 238).....	-5,000	---	---	+5,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM) (Sec. 210).....	-24,000	-23,000	-23,000	+1,000	---
Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association....	-630,500	-749,000	-749,500	-119,000	-500
Policy Development and Research					
Research and Technology.....	46,000	52,000	52,000	+6,000	---
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair Housing Activities.....	70,847	68,000	68,000	-2,847	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-205)	---	---	(+205)
Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes					
Lead Hazard Reduction.....	120,000	120,000	120,000	---	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-600)	---	---	(+600)
Management and Administration					
Working Capital Fund.....	199,035	170,000	175,000	-24,035	+5,000
(By transfer).....	(71,500)	(71,500)	(71,500)	---	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Inspector General.....	124,000	125,600	125,600	+1,600	---
Transformation Initiative.....	50,000	---	50,000	---	+50,000
(By transfer).....	---	(119,870)	---	---	(-119,870)
Total, Management and Administration.....	373,035	295,600	350,600	-22,435	+55,000
(Grand total, Management and Administration).. <td>(1,704,535)</td> <td>(1,645,000)</td> <td>(1,677,214)</td> <td>(-27,321)</td> <td>(+32,214)</td>	(1,704,535)	(1,645,000)	(1,677,214)	(-27,321)	(+32,214)
General Provisions					
Rescission of prior-year advance.....	-650,000	---	---	+650,000	---
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....					
Appropriations.....	37,433,718	33,554,773	33,583,397	-3,850,321	+28,624
Rescissions.....	(39,841,318)	(40,362,773)	(40,391,397)	(+550,079)	(+28,624)
Disaster relief category.....	(-431,600)	---	---	(+431,600)	---
Advance appropriations.....	(100,000)	---	---	(-100,000)	---
Rescissions of prior year advances.....	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	(-650,000)	---	---	(+650,000)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-5,822,000)	(-11,204,000)	(-11,204,000)	(-5,382,000)	---
(by transfer).....	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	---	---
(transfer out).....	71,500	191,370	71,500	---	-119,870
(Limitation on direct loans).....	-71,500	-191,370	-71,500	---	+119,870
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	---	---
	(925,641,504)	(926,507,000)	(925,000,000)	(-641,504)	(-1,507,000)
TITLE III - OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Access Board.....	7,400	7,400	7,400	---	---
Federal Maritime Commission.....	24,100	26,000	25,000	+900	-1,000
Amtrak Office of Inspector General.....	20,500	22,000	25,000	+4,500	+3,000
National Transportation Safety Board.....	102,400	102,400	102,400	---	---
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.....	215,300	213,000	225,300	+10,000	+12,300
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness.....	3,300	3,600	3,300	---	-300
Total, title III, Other Independent Agencies....	373,000	374,400	388,400	+15,400	+14,000
Grand total (net).....	57,312,000	53,479,199	51,606,000	-5,706,000	-1,873,199
Appropriations.....	(58,156,334)	(60,422,666)	(58,549,467)	(+393,133)	(-1,873,199)
Rescissions.....	(-529,334)	(-62,971)	(-62,971)	(+466,363)	---
Disaster relief category.....	(1,762,000)	---	---	(-1,762,000)	---
Rescissions of contract authority.....	(-1,000)	(-72,496)	(-72,496)	(-71,496)	---
Advance appropriations.....	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Rescissions of prior year advances.....	(-650,000)	---	---	(+650,000)	---
Offsetting receipts.....	(-5,822,000)	(-11,204,000)	(-11,204,000)	(-5,382,000)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	---	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(52,068,700)	(53,805,557)	(52,029,480)	(-39,220)	(-1,776,077)
(by transfer).....	71,500	191,370	71,500	---	-119,870
(transfer out).....	-71,500	-191,370	-71,500	---	+119,870
Total budgetary resources.....	(109,380,700)	(107,284,756)	(103,635,480)	(-5,745,220)	(-3,649,276)
Discretionary total.....	(55,550,000)	(53,479,199)	(51,606,000)	(-3,944,000)	(-1,873,199)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses.....	102,481	110,450	108,277	+5,796	-2,173
Immediate Office of the Secretary.....	(2,618)	---	(2,635)	(+17)	(+2,635)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary.....	(984)	---	(992)	(+8)	(+992)
Office of the General Counsel.....	(19,515)	---	(19,615)	(+100)	(+19,615)
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.....	(10,107)	---	(11,248)	(+1,141)	(+11,248)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs.....	(10,538)	---	(12,825)	(+2,287)	(+12,825)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs.....	(2,500)	---	(2,601)	(+101)	(+2,601)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	(25,469)	---	(27,095)	(+1,626)	(+27,095)
Office of Public Affairs.....	(2,020)	---	(2,034)	(+14)	(+2,034)
Office of the Executive Secretariat.....	(1,595)	---	(1,701)	(+106)	(+1,701)
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization.....	(1,369)	---	(1,539)	(+170)	(+1,539)
Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response.....	(10,778)	---	(10,875)	(+97)	(+10,875)
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	(14,988)	---	(15,117)	(+129)	(+15,117)
Research and Development.....	---	13,670	---	---	-13,670
National Infrastructure Investments.....	500,000	500,000	---	-500,000	-500,000
Livable Communities Initiative.....	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Financial Management Capital.....	4,990	10,000	10,000	+5,010	---
Cyber Security Initiatives.....	10,000	6,000	6,000	-4,000	---
Office of Civil Rights.....	9,384	9,773	9,773	+389	---
Transportation Planning, Research, and Development....	9,000	10,000	8,000	-1,000	-2,000
Working Capital Fund.....	(172,000)	---	(174,128)	(+2,128)	(+174,128)
Minority Business Resource Center Program.....	922	1,285	1,285	+363	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(18,367)	(21,955)	(21,955)	(+3,588)	---
Minority Business Outreach.....	3,068	3,234	3,234	+166	---
Payments to Air Carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	143,000	114,000	114,000	-29,000	---
Rescission of excess compensation for general aviation operations.....	-3,254	---	---	+3,254	---
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	779,591	783,412	260,569	-519,022	-522,843
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations.....	9,653,395	9,718,000	9,718,000	+64,605	---
Air traffic organization.....	(7,442,738)	---	(7,513,850)	(+71,112)	(+7,513,850)
Aviation safety.....	(1,252,991)	---	(1,255,000)	(+2,009)	(+1,255,000)
Commercial space transportation.....	(16,271)	---	(16,700)	(+429)	(+16,700)
Finance and management.....	(582,117)	---	(573,591)	(-8,526)	(+573,591)
Human resources programs.....	(98,858)	---	---	(-98,858)	---
Staff offices.....	(200,286)	---	(298,795)	(+98,509)	(+298,795)
NextGen.....	(60,134)	---	(60,064)	(-70)	(+60,064)
Facilities and Equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	2,730,731	2,850,000	2,749,596	+18,865	-100,404
Research, Engineering, and Development (Airport & Airway Trust Fund).....	167,556	180,000	175,000	+7,444	-5,000
Rescission.....	---	-26,184	-26,184	-26,184	---
Subtotal.....	167,556	153,816	148,816	-18,740	-5,000
Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(3,435,000)	(3,400,000)	(3,400,000)	(-35,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(3,350,000)	(3,350,000)	(3,350,000)	---	---
Administration.....	(101,000)	(103,000)	(105,000)	(+4,000)	(+2,000)
Airport Cooperative Research Program.....	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	---	---
Airport technology research.....	(29,250)	(29,300)	(29,300)	(+50)	---
Small community air service development program....	(6,000)	---	---	(-6,000)	---
Chapter 471 reform obligation limitation reduction (legislative proposal).....	---	(-926,000)	---	---	(+926,000)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Aviation Insurance Revolving Fund (Sec. 117).....	---	-1,000	---	---	+1,000
Total, Federal Aviation Administration.....	12,551,682	12,720,816	12,616,412	+64,730	-104,404
Appropriations.....	(12,551,682)	(12,747,000)	(12,642,596)	(+90,914)	(-104,404)
Rescissions.....	---	(-26,184)	(-26,184)	(-26,184)	---
Limitations on obligations.....	(3,350,000)	(2,424,000)	(3,350,000)	---	(+926,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(15,901,682)	(15,144,816)	(15,966,412)	(+64,730)	(+821,596)
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on Administrative Expenses.....	(412,000)	(437,780)	(392,855)	(-19,145)	(-44,925)
Federal-Aid Highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(39,882,583)	(42,569,000)	(39,882,583)	---	(-2,686,417)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(39,143,583)	(41,830,000)	(39,143,583)	---	(-2,686,417)
(Exempt contract authority).....	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Emergency Relief (disaster relief category).....	1,662,000	---	---	-1,662,000	---
Total, Federal Highway Administration.....	1,662,000	---	---	-1,662,000	---
Disaster relief category.....	(1,662,000)	---	---	(-1,662,000)	---
Limitations on obligations.....	(39,143,583)	(41,830,000)	(39,143,583)	---	(-2,686,417)
Exempt contract authority.....	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Total budgetary resources.....	(41,544,583)	(42,569,000)	(39,882,583)	(-1,662,000)	(-2,686,417)
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration					
Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs (Highway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)..	(247,724)	(250,000)	(244,144)	(-3,580)	(-5,856)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(247,724)	(250,000)	(244,144)	(-3,580)	(-5,856)
Motor Carrier Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(307,000)	(330,000)	(307,000)	---	(-23,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(307,000)	(330,000)	(307,000)	---	(-23,000)
CVISN contract authority (Sec. 131).....	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
Rescission of contract authority.....	-1,000	---	---	+1,000	---
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.....	---	---	---	---	---
Limitations on obligations.....	(554,724)	(580,000)	(551,144)	(-3,580)	(-28,856)
Total budgetary resources.....	(554,724)	(580,000)	(551,144)	(-3,580)	(-28,856)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and Research (general fund).....	140,146	---	152,000	+11,854	+152,000
Vehicle Safety.....	---	188,000	---	---	-188,000
Operations and Research (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(109,500)	(150,000)	(122,360)	(+12,860)	(-27,640)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(109,500)	---	(122,360)	(+12,860)	(+122,360)
Highway Safety Research and Development					
(Limitation on obligations).....	---	(150,000)	---	---	(-150,000)
Subtotal.....	249,646	338,000	274,360	+24,714	-83,640
Highway Traffic Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(550,328)	(643,000)	(501,828)	(-48,500)	(-141,172)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(550,328)	(643,000)	(501,828)	(-48,500)	(-141,172)
Highway safety programs (23 USC 402).....	(235,000)	(317,500)	(235,000)	---	(-82,500)
Occupant protection incentive grants(23 USC 405)	(25,000)	(40,000)	(25,000)	---	(-15,000)
Safety belt performance grants (23 USC 406).....	(48,500)	---	---	(-48,500)	---
Distracted driving prevention.....	---	(50,000)	---	---	(-50,000)
State traffic safety information system					
improvement(23 USC 408).....	(34,500)	(34,500)	(34,500)	---	---
Impaired driving countermeasures (23 USC 410)...	(139,000)	(139,000)	(139,000)	---	---
Grant administration.....	(25,328)	(18,000)	(25,328)	---	(+7,328)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
High visibility enforcement.....	(29,000)	(37,000)	(29,000)	---	(-8,000)
Child safety and booster seat grants.....	(7,000)	---	(7,000)	---	(+7,000)
Motorcyclist safety.....	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	---	---
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.....	140,146	188,000	152,000	+11,854	-36,000
Limitations on obligations.....	(659,828)	(793,000)	(624,188)	(-35,640)	(-168,812)
Total budgetary resources.....	(799,974)	(981,000)	(776,188)	(-23,786)	(-204,812)
Federal Railroad Administration					
Safety and Operations.....	178,596	196,000	184,000	+5,404	-12,000
Offsetting fee collections (legislative proposal).....	---	-40,000	---	---	+40,000
Direct appropriation.....	178,596	156,000	184,000	+5,404	+28,000
Railroad Research and Development.....	35,000	35,500	35,500	+500	---
System Preservation.....	---	1,546,000	---	---	-1,546,000
Network Development.....	---	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000
National Railroad Passenger Corporation:					
Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.....	466,000	---	350,000	-116,000	+350,000
Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.....	952,000	---	1,452,000	+500,000	+1,452,000
Subtotal.....	1,418,000	---	1,802,000	+384,000	+1,802,000
Next Gen High Speed Rail Service (rescission).....	---	-1,973	-1,973	-1,973	---
Northeast Corridor Improvement Program (rescission)....	---	-4,419	-4,419	-4,419	---
Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....	1,631,596	2,731,108	2,015,108	+383,512	-716,000
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative Expenses.....	98,713	---	100,000	+1,287	+100,000
Formula and Bus Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(9,400,000)	---	(9,400,000)	---	(+9,400,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(8,360,565)	---	(8,360,565)	---	(+8,360,565)
Rescission of prior year contract authority.....	---	-72,496	-72,496	-72,496	---
Research and Technology Deployment.....	---	120,957	---	---	-120,957
Transit Formula Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	---	(9,500,000)	---	---	(-9,500,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	---	(4,759,372)	---	---	(-4,759,372)
Transit Expansion and Livable Communities (liquidation of contract authorization).....	---	(1,500,000)	---	---	(-1,500,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	---	(212,185)	---	---	(-212,185)
Capital Investment Grants.....	---	2,235,486	---	---	-2,235,486
Operations and Safety.....	---	166,000	---	---	-166,000
Administrative programs.....	---	(129,700)	---	---	(-129,700)
Rail transit safety programs.....	---	(36,300)	---	---	(-36,300)
Research and University Research Centers.....	44,000	---	44,000	---	+44,000
Bus and Rail State of Good Repair (liquidation of contract authorization).....	---	(1,500,000)	---	---	(-1,500,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	---	(3,207,000)	---	---	(-3,207,000)
Capital Investment Grants.....	1,955,000	---	1,816,993	-138,007	+1,816,993
Rescission.....	-58,500	-11,429	-11,429	+47,071	---
Subtotal.....	1,896,500	-11,429	1,805,564	-90,936	+1,816,993

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority					
Capital and Preventive Maintenance.....	150,000	135,000	150,000	---	+15,000
Rescission.....	---	-523	-523	-523	---
Subtotal.....	150,000	134,477	149,477	-523	+15,000
University Transportation Research (rescission).....	---	-293	-293	-293	---
Job Access and Reverse Commute Grants (rescission)....	---	-14,662	-14,662	-14,662	---
Research, Training and Human Resources (rescission)...	---	-248	-248	-248	---
Interstate Transfer Grants (rescission).....	---	-2,662	-2,662	-2,662	---
Urban discretionary accounts (rescission).....	---	-578	-578	-578	---
Total, Federal Transit Administration.....	2,189,213	2,554,552	2,008,102	-181,111	-546,450
Appropriations.....	(2,247,713)	(2,657,443)	(2,110,993)	(-136,720)	(-546,450)
Rescissions.....	(-58,500)	(-30,395)	(-30,395)	(+28,105)	---
Limitations on obligations.....	(8,360,565)	(8,178,557)	(8,360,565)	---	(+182,008)
Total budgetary resources.....	(10,549,778)	(10,733,109)	(10,368,667)	(-181,111)	(-364,442)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and Maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund).....	32,259	33,000	33,000	+741	---
Maritime Administration					
Maritime Security Program.....	174,000	184,000	184,000	+10,000	---
Operations and Training.....	156,258	146,298	145,753	-10,505	-545
Rescission.....	-980	---	---	+980	---
Ship Disposal.....	5,500	10,000	4,000	-1,500	-6,000
Assistance to Small Shipyards.....	9,980	---	---	-9,980	---
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account:					
Administrative expenses.....	3,740	3,750	3,750	+10	---
Rescission.....	-35,000	---	---	+35,000	---
Subtotal.....	-31,260	3,750	3,750	+35,010	---
Total, Maritime Administration.....	313,498	344,048	337,503	+24,005	-6,545
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration					
Operational Expenses:					
General Fund.....	20,721	20,408	22,391	+1,670	+1,983
Pipeline Safety Fund.....	639	639	639	---	---
Pipeline Safety information grants to communities.....	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,500)	(+500)	(+500)
Subtotal.....	21,360	21,047	23,030	+1,670	+1,983
Hazardous Materials Safety.....	42,338	50,673	42,546	+208	-8,127
Pipeline Safety:					
Pipeline Safety Fund.....	90,679	150,500	90,679	---	-59,821
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.....	18,573	21,510	18,573	---	-2,937
Pipeline Safety Design Review Fund (leg. proposal).....	---	4,000	2,000	+2,000	-2,000
Subtotal.....	109,252	176,010	111,252	+2,000	-64,758
Subtotal, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.....	172,950	247,730	176,828	+3,878	-70,902
Pipeline safety user fees.....	-91,318	-151,139	-91,318	---	+59,821
Special permit and approval fees (leg. proposal).....	---	-12,000	---	---	+12,000
Pipeline Safety Design Review fee (leg. proposal).....	---	-4,000	-2,000	-2,000	+2,000

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Emergency Preparedness Grants:					
Limitation on emergency preparedness fund.....	(28,318)	(28,318)	(28,318)	---	---
(Emergency preparedness fund).....	(188)	(188)	(188)	---	---
Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.....					
	81,632	80,591	83,510	+1,878	+2,919
Research and Innovative Technology Administration					
Research and Development.....	15,981	---	13,500	-2,481	+13,500
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and Expenses.....	79,624	84,499	84,499	+4,875	---
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and Expenses.....	29,310	31,250	31,250	+1,940	---
Offsetting collections.....	-1,250	-1,250	-1,250	---	---
Total, Surface Transportation Board.....					
	28,060	30,000	30,000	+1,940	---
=====					
Total, title I, Department of Transportation..	19,505,282	19,550,026	17,634,203	-1,871,079	-1,915,823
Appropriations.....	(17,942,016)	(19,685,493)	(17,769,670)	(-172,346)	(-1,915,823)
Rescissions.....	(-97,734)	(-62,971)	(-62,971)	(+34,763)	---
Disaster relief category.....	(1,662,000)	---	---	(-1,662,000)	---
Rescissions of contract authority.....	(-1,000)	(-72,496)	(-72,496)	(-71,496)	---
Limitations on obligations.....	(52,068,700)	(53,805,557)	(52,029,480)	(-39,220)	(-1,776,077)
Total budgetary resources.....					
	(71,573,982)	(73,355,583)	(69,663,683)	(-1,910,299)	(-3,691,900)
=====					
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Management and Administration					
Administration, Operations and Management.....	537,789	532,546	518,068	-19,721	-14,478
Program Office Salaries and Expenses:					
Public and Indian Housing.....	200,000	211,634	206,500	+6,500	-5,134
Community Planning and Development.....	100,000	103,882	103,500	+3,500	-382
Housing.....	391,500	398,832	396,500	+5,000	-2,332
Policy Development and Research.....	22,211	21,394	22,326	+115	+932
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.....	72,600	74,296	72,904	+304	-1,392
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control...	7,400	6,816	6,816	-584	---
Subtotal.....					
	793,711	816,854	808,546	+14,835	-8,308
Total, Management and Administration.....					
	1,331,500	1,349,400	1,326,614	-4,886	-22,786
Public and Indian Housing					
Tenant-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals.....	17,242,351	17,237,948	17,237,948	-4,403	---
Tenant protection vouchers.....	75,000	75,000	75,000	---	---
Administrative fees.....	1,350,000	1,575,000	1,575,000	+225,000	---
Family self-sufficiency coordinators.....	60,000	---	60,000	---	+60,000
Veterans affairs supportive housing.....	75,000	75,000	75,000	---	---
Sec. 811 mainstream voucher renewals.....	112,018	111,335	111,335	-683	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-25,000)	---	---	(+25,000)
Subtotal (available this fiscal year).....					
	18,914,369	19,074,283	19,134,283	+219,914	+60,000

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Advance appropriations.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances.....	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	---	---
Total, Tenant-based Rental Assistance appropriated in this bill.....	18,914,369	19,074,283	19,134,283	+219,914	+60,000
Public Housing Capital Fund.....	1,875,000	2,070,000	1,985,000	+110,000	-85,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-10,350)	---	---	(+10,350)
Public Housing Operating Fund.....	3,961,850	4,524,000	4,524,000	+562,150	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-22,620)	---	---	(+22,620)
Choice neighborhoods.....	120,000	150,000	---	-120,000	-150,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-750)	---	---	(+750)
Family Self-Sufficiency.....	---	60,000	---	---	-60,000
Native American Housing Block Grants.....	650,000	650,000	650,000	---	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-3,250)	---	---	(+3,250)
Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant.....	13,000	13,000	---	-13,000	-13,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-65)	---	---	(+65)
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account....	6,000	7,000	6,000	---	-1,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(360,000)	(900,000)	---	(-360,000)	(-900,000)
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-35)	---	---	(+35)
Native Hawaiian Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account....	386	1,000	---	-386	-1,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(41,504)	(107,000)	---	(-41,504)	(-107,000)
Housing Certificate Fund (rescission).....	-200,000	---	---	+200,000	---
Total, Public and Indian Housing.....	25,340,605	26,549,283	26,299,283	+958,678	-250,000
Community Planning and Development					
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS.....	332,000	330,000	330,000	-2,000	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,650)	---	---	(+1,650)
Community Development Fund.....	2,948,090	2,948,090	3,404,000	+455,910	+455,910
Indian CDBG.....	60,000	60,000	---	-60,000	-60,000
Sustainable housing and communities.....	---	100,000	---	---	-100,000
Capacity building.....	---	35,000	---	---	-35,000
Disaster relief.....	300,000	---	---	-300,000	---
(Disaster relief category).....	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
Subtotal.....	3,408,090	3,143,090	3,404,000	-4,090	+260,910
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-15,715)	---	---	(+15,715)
Community Development Loan Guarantees (Section 108):					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(240,000)	(500,000)	---	(-240,000)	(-500,000)
Credit subsidy.....	5,952	---	6,000	+48	+6,000
HOME Investment Partnerships Program.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,200,000	+200,000	+200,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-5,000)	---	---	(+5,000)
Self-help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program.....	53,500	---	60,000	+6,500	+60,000
Homeless Assistance Grants.....	1,901,190	2,231,000	2,000,000	+98,810	-231,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-11,155)	---	---	(+11,155)
Total, Community Planning and Development.....	6,700,732	6,704,090	7,000,000	+299,268	+295,910
Housing Programs					
Project-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals.....	9,050,672	8,440,400	8,440,400	-610,272	---
Contract administrators.....	289,000	260,000	260,000	-29,000	---
Subtotal (available this fiscal year).....	9,339,672	8,700,400	8,700,400	-639,272	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-19,000)	---	---	(+19,000)
Advance appropriations.....	400,000	400,000	400,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances.....	-400,000	-400,000	-400,000	---	---
Total, Project-based rental assistance appropriated in this bill.....	9,339,672	8,700,400	8,700,400	-639,272	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Housing for the Elderly.....	374,627	475,000	425,000	+50,373	-50,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-2,375)	---	---	(+2,375)
Housing for Persons with Disabilities.....	165,000	150,000	165,000	---	+15,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-750)	---	---	(+750)
Housing Counseling Assistance.....	45,000	55,000	45,000	---	-10,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-275)	---	---	(+275)
Rental Housing Assistance.....	1,300	---	---	-1,300	---
Rent Supplement (rescission).....	-231,600	---	---	+231,600	---
Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund.....	6,500	8,000	4,000	-2,500	-4,000
Offsetting collections.....	-4,000	-4,000	-4,000	---	---
Subtotal.....	2,500	4,000	---	-2,500	-4,000
Total, Housing Programs.....	9,696,499	9,384,400	9,335,400	-361,099	-49,000
Appropriations.....	(9,932,099)	(9,388,400)	(9,339,400)	(-592,699)	(-49,000)
Rescissions.....	(-231,600)	---	---	(+231,600)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	---	---
Federal Housing Administration					
Mutual Mortgage Insurance Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-4,427,000	-9,676,000	-9,676,000	-5,249,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM) (Sec. 210).....	-286,000	-170,000	-170,000	+116,000	---
Additional offsetting receipts (Sec. 238).....	-59,000	---	---	+59,000	---
Administrative contract expenses.....	207,000	215,000	215,000	+8,000	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,075)	---	---	(+1,075)
Working capital fund (transfer out).....	(-71,500)	(-71,500)	(-71,500)	---	---
General and Special Risk Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-400,000	-588,000	-588,000	-188,000	---
Total, Federal Housing Administration.....	-4,965,000	-10,219,000	-10,219,000	-5,254,000	---
Government National Mortgage Association					
Guarantees of Mortgage-backed Securities Loan					
Guarantee Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses (legislative proposal).....	19,500	21,000	20,500	+1,000	-500
Offsetting receipts (legislative proposal).....	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-521,000	-647,000	-647,000	-126,000	---
Offsetting receipts (Sec. 238).....	-5,000	---	---	+5,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM) (Sec. 210).....	-24,000	-23,000	-23,000	+1,000	---
Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association....	-630,500	-749,000	-749,500	-119,000	-500
Policy Development and Research					
Research and Technology.....	46,000	52,000	52,000	+6,000	---
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair Housing Activities.....	70,847	68,000	68,000	-2,847	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-205)	---	---	(+205)
Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes					
Lead Hazard Reduction.....	120,000	120,000	120,000	---	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-600)	---	---	(+600)
Management and Administration					
Working Capital Fund.....	199,035	170,000	175,000	-24,035	+5,000
(By transfer).....	(71,500)	(71,500)	(71,500)	---	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013 (H.R. 5972)
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Inspector General.....	124,000	125,600	125,600	+1,600	---
Transformation Initiative.....	50,000	---	50,000	---	+50,000
(By transfer).....	---	(119,870)	---	---	(-119,870)
Total, Management and Administration.....	373,035	295,600	350,600	-22,435	+55,000
(Grand total, Management and Administration).. <td>(1,704,535)</td> <td>(1,645,000)</td> <td>(1,677,214)</td> <td>(-27,321)</td> <td>(+32,214)</td>	(1,704,535)	(1,645,000)	(1,677,214)	(-27,321)	(+32,214)
General Provisions					
Rescission of prior-year advance.....	-650,000	---	---	+650,000	---
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	37,433,718	33,554,773	33,583,397	-3,850,321	+28,624
Appropriations.....	(39,841,318)	(40,362,773)	(40,391,397)	(+550,079)	(+28,624)
Rescissions.....	(-431,600)	---	---	(+431,600)	---
Disaster relief category.....	(100,000)	---	---	(-100,000)	---
Advance appropriations.....	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Rescissions of prior year advances.....	(-650,000)	---	---	(+650,000)	---
Offsetting receipts.....	(-5,822,000)	(-11,204,000)	(-11,204,000)	(-5,382,000)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	---	---
(by transfer).....	71,500	191,370	71,500	---	-119,870
(transfer out).....	-71,500	-191,370	-71,500	---	+119,870
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	---	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(925,641,504)	(926,507,000)	(925,000,000)	(-641,504)	(-1,507,000)
TITLE III - OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Access Board.....	7,400	7,400	7,400	---	---
Federal Maritime Commission.....	24,100	26,000	25,000	+900	-1,000
Amtrak Office of Inspector General.....	20,500	22,000	25,000	+4,500	+3,000
National Transportation Safety Board.....	102,400	102,400	102,400	---	---
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.....	215,300	213,000	225,300	+10,000	+12,300
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness.....	3,300	3,600	3,300	---	-300
Total, title III, Other Independent Agencies....	373,000	374,400	388,400	+15,400	+14,000
Grand total (net).....	57,312,000	53,479,199	51,606,000	-5,706,000	-1,873,199
Appropriations.....	(58,156,334)	(60,422,666)	(58,549,467)	(+393,133)	(-1,873,199)
Rescissions.....	(-529,334)	(-62,971)	(-62,971)	(+466,363)	---
Disaster relief category.....	(1,762,000)	---	---	(-1,762,000)	---
Rescissions of contract authority.....	(-1,000)	(-72,496)	(-72,496)	(-71,496)	---
Advance appropriations.....	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Rescissions of prior year advances.....	(-650,000)	---	---	(+650,000)	---
Offsetting receipts.....	(-5,822,000)	(-11,204,000)	(-11,204,000)	(-5,382,000)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	---	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(52,068,700)	(53,805,557)	(52,029,480)	(-39,220)	(-1,776,077)
(by transfer).....	71,500	191,370	71,500	---	-119,870
(transfer out).....	-71,500	-191,370	-71,500	---	+119,870
Total budgetary resources.....	(109,380,700)	(107,284,756)	(103,635,480)	(-5,745,220)	(-3,649,276)
Discretionary total.....	(55,550,000)	(53,479,199)	(51,606,000)	(-3,944,000)	(-1,873,199)

□ 1230

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF
GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$6,500,000)”.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$6,500,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. My amendment would reduce the proposed funding for salaries and expenses of the Office of Public and Indian Housing by \$6.5 million. This is one of 13 offices which would receive increases for administrative expenses in the underlying bill.

Madam Chairman, we're in an economic emergency as a Nation. We're broke. We absolutely must stop spending money that we don't have. We're borrowing 40 cents or more on every dollar that the Federal Government expends. Raising the funding for the Office of Public and Indian Housing by \$6.5 million while we're broke makes no fiscal sense to me.

This particular increase is among the highest for all the offices funded under this legislation. My amendment would simply freeze funding for this office for this next year. Passage of my amendment would bring this account back to this year's FY 2012 levels.

I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

It's a good talking point, reducing administration accounts that received increases. We've scrubbed these accounts. We've held hearings, asked questions, and made recommendations about what should be funded rather than looking at an arbitrary number. The bill cuts \$4 billion from fiscal year 2012, which is a fiscally responsible level.

I would urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. The amendment that has been offered removes a 3 percent increase in the administrative account for the Office of Public and Indian Housing. I rise to oppose the amendment.

In this instance, the cuts in the Office of Public and Indian Housing cover a number of things, including the VASH program. We're adding \$75 million for additional VASH vouchers—veterans' homelessness vouchers—and

that has to be administered. The arbitrary \$6.5 million simply does not help with that effort. It hurts that effort.

The Office also implements the operating and capital funds for public housing and the Native American housing grants. All of these require either layoffs, removal of people, because the salaries and expenses of the Office are subject to normal increases, small increases year by year for salaries for people in those places, and they are clearly going to end up having to reduce the number of personnel while they're administering more, and particularly the housing and the homeless program for veterans.

So on that basis, I think this is an unwise reduction and one that is unjustified as well as unwise, and I would urge a “no” vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Community Planning and Development, \$103,500,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF
GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,500,000)”.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,500,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. My amendment would reduce the proposed funding for salaries and expenses for the Office of Community Planning and Development by \$3.5 million.

This amendment, like the ones I presented last night and the one I just presented, would freeze the funding for these offices. I've heard my good friend from Iowa and my good friends on the other side talk about how the underlying bill has cut expenses for this whole underlying bill, but here in the House of Representatives, we've reduced our expenses by over 11 percent. It seems to me that it just makes fiscal sense to freeze funding for these offices in the underlying bill and not raise them.

We're in an economic emergency as a Nation. We are spending money that

we simply do not have. We've got to stop the outrageous spending that's going on here in Washington, and I'm just asking a simple thing: let's freeze all of these offices at the current year's levels for 1 more year. Hopefully, next year we'll have policy put in place that will increase our economy and start creating jobs here in this Nation, but we're not doing that this year with this administration and the policies that we see in the other body on the other side of the Hill.

So let's just freeze the expenses of this office, and I'm proposing to freeze the expenses of virtually all the offices in this bill—most of them, anyway—and my amendment would bring the spending level that's proposed back to the current spending level of 2012.

When families and businesses get overextended, they don't continue to raise their spending levels, and we should not be raising this one either. My amendment would just freeze it at the current spending levels.

I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. This amendment again, as the gentleman has said, is an amendment that would freeze at the level of the 2012 funding here for salaries and expenses of the Office of Community Planning and Development.

Now, this office, it turns out, administers and implements the CDBG program, which in the bill, as presented by my chairman, is increased substantially—several hundred million dollars in the CDBG program—and increases the funding for the HOME program, which had been held at a much lower level in last year's program. In both of those cases, they were considerably lower.

□ 1240

And just last night, we added an amendment to increase the funding for HPWA, Helping Persons With AIDS, one of those vulnerable populations that we have, and our housing programs—as with veterans who are homeless, others who are homeless, those who are vulnerable such as those living with AIDS—have proven to be rather strong programs that have strong support.

Furthermore, already, across the board in HUD, there has been a reduction in personnel services and in the salaries and expenses of \$20 million already compared with last year's overall within HUD. So this is a duplicate and hitting at vulnerable populations that we do not want to or should not want to be reducing. The reduction again requires that there be some reduction in personnel because people's salaries go up. They go up because people get a COLA, or a cost-of-living increase, of some sort with their salaries, or they move up in their category because of

longevity. So it ends up putting people who have jobs out of work and reducing the personnel to provide service to the American people and slows down the work of the offices in all these places where I think we all have a stake in making certain that they are efficiently implemented.

So I would urge a “no” vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. We went through the hearing process. We have worked on these numbers to, number one, stay within our allocation, which we have done—we are actually cutting \$4 billion in this bill—but also to prioritize. There’s no one more sensitive about hardworking taxpayer dollars than I am. But the fact of the matter is, this is an absolutely critical function. The increase that is here is extremely important so that these programs are carried out properly without waste, fraud, and abuse.

For that reason, I would again urge a “no” vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Housing, \$396,500,000, of which at least \$8,200,000 shall be for the Office of Risk and Regulatory Affairs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, my amendment would reduce the proposed funding for salaries and expenses of bureaucrats here in Washington at the Office of Housing by \$5 million. That’s absolutely correct.

This amendment, as well as all of my amendments, will not cut the programs. It will not cut the programs one iota. What this does is it reduces the salaries.

I just heard my good friend from Massachusetts talking about Federal bureaucrats getting raises. I have frozen the salaries of people who work for me, and I know many Members of Congress have, for the last 2 years. Why should we be giving Federal bureaucrats more money when the American people are not getting raises? It makes no sense to me, particularly as we are in an economic emergency. We are spending money we don’t have. We have to stop the outrageous spending that’s going on here in Washington. Enough is enough. And raising this office, as well as all these offices, above the 2012 makes no economic sense to me whatsoever. Let’s be fiscally responsible.

My good friend from Iowa, who I have the utmost respect for, has done a tremendous job in this bill, and I do appreciate the tremendous hard work that he and his committee has done. And I appreciate the \$4 million that they’ve cut. But why raise the salaries of Federal bureaucrats?

My amendment would simply reduce the proposed funding back to the 2012 levels. I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I again rise in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment. There are some factors that we need to take into consideration. For one thing next year, next fiscal year, we have an additional compensable day which has to be paid for. We have GSA that has raised rents. We have already cut \$14 million out of salaries and expenses, so we would not be able to meet our requirements. We are not giving Federal employees raises, but there are additional costs that come into play because of rents, because of the additional day that our Federal workers will be working next year. And for those reasons—and again, I want to reiterate, we have cut \$14 million out of this account—I would just urge a “no” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. In this instance, it is again a case of freezing a salaries and expenses account at the previous year’s level. But this one has an interesting sidelight in that, in the legislation that we have before us, we have adopted a Presidential recommendation for a partial-year funding for project-based section 8 vouchers, which is going to cause considerable additional administration than the usual program of doing full-year continuation of those voucher programs. There is going to be much uncertainty if this goes on all the way to adoption. There would be much uncertainty for the people who

are the owners and providers of that housing, and probably some loss in actual affordable housing available under the project-based section 8 program. So this is a case where they need that assistance. This is where we administer the housing programs for the elderly and disabled, the so-called 202 programs and 811, chapters 202 and chapter 811 for elderly and disabled people, as well as housing counseling assistance.

In addition, we have the Federal Housing Administration, which is having a much larger level of activity as we are trying to dig out of the foreclosure crisis from the past, and that agency needs to have personnel that are qualified and able to do the right job.

So again here—and by the way, I made an error in my previous comments when I said there was a reduction across the board for HUD. What I should have indicated was that it was a reduction in the salaries and expenses account over a period of time going back to 2010 of \$20 million across the programs of salaries and expenses within HUD over that time.

□ 1230

So I made a mistake saying it was a \$20 million reduction in 1 year. But for all those reasons, I urge a “no” vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Policy Development and Research, \$22,326,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$115,000)”.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$115,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, again I rise to propose an amendment just to freeze the salaries of this Office of Policy Development and Research by a mere \$115,000.

Madam Chairman, I hear colleagues around here talking as if millions of dollars, tens of millions—hundreds of millions of dollars is nothing. Well,

most of my constituents at home in Georgia, most Americans think that \$1 million is a lot of money, and I certainly think \$1 million is a lot of money. But we have proposed, in this underlying bill, to raise the administrative expenses and salaries.

My good friend from Massachusetts, in the previous amendment, said we need to increase the salaries of the bureaucrats. I hope my good friend from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), when he stood up on the last amendment saying that we weren't going to increase salaries of Federal bureaucrats, is factual. I hope that that goes in the RECORD and it becomes true that we're not going to raise the salaries of Federal bureaucrats.

But they're proposing raising the administrative expenses and salaries in all of these offices, so I'm proposing just to freeze these expenses for 1 more year. Let's bring this account back down to this current year's levels of spending.

We cannot continue on this road.

Madam Chairman, I'm a medical doctor. As a medical doctor, part of my medical practice for many years has been involved in treating addictions, drug and alcohol addictions. In addiction medicine, we have a saying: When there's no denial, there's no addiction.

Congress and government have a spending addiction. It's a spending addiction, and there's a tremendous amount of denial here in this city—in all branches of government, actually. We need to face the fact: We're broke as a Nation. We've got to stop the outrageous spending.

I'm proposing just a mere \$115,000 to freeze the expenses for this office and salaries for this office for 1 more year. I don't think that's too much for me to ask. I don't think that's too much for the American taxpayer, the hard-working American taxpayer to ask for us to freeze the salaries of these bureaucrats here in Washington and freeze their expenses for 1 more year—not only for this amendment, but for the amendments that I've already presented and the ones that I will present. Let's freeze this spending for 1 more year, keep it at the FY 2012 levels.

I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLIVER. Madam Chairperson, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman from Georgia just wants to freeze everything. But our personnel, in an agency like this, they are subject to the civil service laws, to the personnel laws under OPM, and they are assigned in grades and then steps. They add several steps as they gain seniority and go from step 1 to step 7, and then they may sit for a while. But you end up with people—unless you're really trying to put people out of work. Unless you're trying to put people out of work—and there's no reason to do that

for this kind of an agency at all—then there has to be a slow, small increase for those people who move from step to step along the salary scale.

So this is an amendment that would essentially cause disruption in the processing and in the personnel system for the agency, which has lots of work to do. We should be worrying about how to get productivity in the processing rather than about trying to jigger and freeze a step system's pay scale for the people who do the work at these agencies.

I again urge that this amendment not be adopted, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, I rise to disagree with the rhetoric and the mythology propounded here by the gentleman from Georgia.

The mythology is that we have a tremendous spending binge that we must reduce, that the country is broke, and it's broke because we're spending much too much money and we've got to reduce the spending. It's simply not true.

Twelve years ago, in 2000, we were looking at a \$5.6 trillion surplus over the next 10 years. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Alan Greenspan, testifying in favor of President Bush's tax reductions, said we have to reduce taxes, because if we don't, we will pay off the entire national debt by 2012 and that would be a bad thing, for some reason which I won't go into now. He thought it would be a bad thing if we paid off the entire national debt.

The entire debate between the two candidates, Bush and Gore, then was: What should we do with this \$5.6 trillion surplus.

How did we change from a \$5.6 trillion surplus to the budget deficits we have right now? Not by increasing spending. If you look at the spending amount other than military, if you look at the discretionary spending of the Federal Government other than military, adjusted for inflation and population growth, it has not increased by a nickel since 2001, not by a nickel.

What has changed? What has changed to create the deficit? Because if you want to solve the deficit, you have to know what created it to undo it. What has changed to create the deficit is several things:

One, 40 percent of the deficit is caused by the Bush tax cuts, which will expire at the end of the year unless we change that. Forty percent of the current and anticipated deficits were caused by the Bush tax cuts of 2001 and 2003;

Second, two unfunded wars in Iraq and Afghanistan—the first time in American history we fought major wars without increasing taxes to pay for them;

Third, aside from the wars, completely aside from the wars, we have

doubled Pentagon spending since 2001 in real terms; and

Finally, we have a depression, or a recession. When you have a recession that started in 2007 or 2008, tax receipts go down. Expenses on things like food stamps and unemployment insurance goes up. That's when you should run a deficit. You should run a surplus in good times; you should run a deficit during a depression or recession in order to stimulate the economy and get it back up.

If we want to deal with the deficit—and we should deal with the deficit—we shouldn't reduce necessary government spending and certainly not nickel-and-dime step pay increases for Federal employees. If we want to reduce the deficit, we should undo most of the Bush tax cuts for the rich, because most of the Bush tax cuts went to rich people and to very large corporations. We are only collecting about 14 or 15 percent of GDP in taxes this year.

□ 1300

The normal range is between 19 and 21 percent. And I say "normal," meaning the entire post-World War II period ranges between 18 or 19 and 22 percent. We're collecting 14 or 15 percent in the last couple of years because, one, the recession, and, two, because we greatly reduced effective taxes on multinational corporations and on rich people.

We used to have in this country, under President Reagan, 25 different tax brackets. Someone making \$5 million paid a higher tax rate than someone making \$1 million, who paid a higher tax rate than someone making \$250,000 and so forth. Now, the highest tax rate kicks in at below \$250,000, and someone making \$250 million pays no higher tax rate than someone making \$175,000 or \$200,000. There's something very wrong with that.

So if we want to deal with the deficit, deal not with the nonexistent problem, which is the huge nonexistent spending surge that didn't occur. And we have great needs in this country. We have to fix our highways, our roads, our bridges, our hospitals, our broadband. We have to invest so this country will be economically competitive, and our schools and our teachers and our cops and all of these things.

If you want to fix the deficit, don't shortchange what we should be doing to invest in this country. Get rid of the Bush tax cuts, or most of them, or get rid of those portions of the Bush taxes that went to rich people, high-income people and to big corporations. Make corporations, the large corporations, pay an effective tax rate again, instead of a large number of our top corporations paying zero dollars in taxes.

Reduce the Pentagon budget, which we can do. We no longer need all those troops in Germany to protect against a Soviet tank invasion, which is not likely to occur since the Soviets don't exist anymore. That's what we ought to be doing.

But the key thing is don't have this mythology that we have greatly expanded Federal spending over the last

10 years, or even over the last 3 years, which is simply not the case.

I yield back the balance of my time.
The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, \$72,904,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$304,000)”.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$304,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, again I rise just to freeze the funding for salaries and office expenses for the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity by a meager \$304,000. If we cannot cut out \$115,000 or \$304,000, what are we going to cut?

And as my friend from Massachusetts already said, actually, on two of my amendments, that it's to increase salaries of Federal bureaucrats. We've got to freeze the salaries of these bureaucrats. We've got to be fiscally responsible.

My amendment doesn't cut any program, doesn't cut any service, doesn't cut out any part of the necessary aspects of the Federal Government. All it does is it freezes the salaries and the expenses of this office, as the other amendments would do. It freezes it at this year's levels. Doesn't even go backwards, freezes it at this year's levels.

I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chair, now at this point we have—I think this is the last of this group of amendments that have been proposed in this area, in essence. And when you put them together, because one was for \$6.5 million, one was for about \$5 million, then there were a couple that were a little—there was one that was a little over \$1 million and then a couple that were smaller—the sum total of people who will be taken out of the—who this

would require, the freeze, in that way, would require that some number around 200-or-so employees would be put out of positions.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia thinks that, well, they're Federal bureaucrats; but they're providing a service. In this instance, it is the service in the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, which has a budget, total budget, of \$70-million-or-so. And this 300,000 is only a couple of percent out of it.

Most of the salaries and expenses, most of these agencies that he has been affecting are mostly done in salaries and expenses of the operation of the office. But they all provide a public service to people. In this instance, it's the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.

Well, it ensures that Americans have the same right, that all Americans have the same right to housing and investigates instances where those rights have been violated. So we are, in every instance of them, and we dealt with a couple of similar ones last night before in the other department under this bill—they only serve to slow down the effective operation of those offices to provide services across the whole gamut of things which have been given to them to do, whether it be public housing, whether it be the Veterans Administration program, here the Fair Housing Administration program, the FHA, the housing for elders, housing for disabled people. All of them are the same ilk. There's no reason to do anything other than the same thing that we have done in the past. And so I'm urging, again, a “no” vote on this.

I yield back the balance of my time;
Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I understand the gentleman, and I appreciate the fact that he wants to cut spending. We have, in fact, in this bill cut the spending from the request \$1.4 million on this particular line item in the budget.

The fact of the matter is, Madam Chair, we have additional rent that we have to pay. We have an extra day of work for the Federal workers next year that we have to pay. So there's not going to be any increase. It's basically going to maintain where we are in this function.

But, again, we have already cut from the President's request, \$1.4 million. And there are additional costs we're going to incur just to stay even from last year. So with that, I would urge a “no” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.
The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF HEALTHY HOMES AND LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control, \$6,816,000.

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For activities and assistance for the provision of tenant-based rental assistance authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) (“the Act” herein), not otherwise provided for, \$15,134,283,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2012 (in addition to the \$4,000,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available on October 1, 2012), and \$4,000,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2013: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this heading are provided as follows:

(1) \$17,237,948,000 shall be available for renewals of expiring section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts (including renewals of enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act) and including renewal of other special purpose incremental vouchers: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, from amounts provided under this paragraph and any carryover, the Secretary for the calendar year 2013 funding cycle shall provide renewal funding for each public housing agency based on validated voucher management system (VMS) leasing and cost data for the prior calendar year and by applying an inflation factor as established by the Secretary, by notice published in the Federal Register, and by making any necessary adjustments for the costs associated with the first-time renewal of vouchers under this paragraph including tenant protection and HOPE VI vouchers: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this paragraph may be used to fund a total number of unit months under lease which exceeds a public housing agency's authorized level of units under contract, except for public housing agencies participating in the Moving to Work (MTW) demonstration, which are instead governed by the terms and conditions of their MTW agreements: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, to the extent necessary to stay within the amount specified under this paragraph, pro rate each public housing agency's allocation otherwise established pursuant to this paragraph: *Provided further*, That except as provided in the following provisos, the entire amount specified under this paragraph (except as otherwise modified under this Act) shall be obligated to the public housing agencies based on the allocation and pro rata method described above, and the Secretary shall notify public housing agencies of their annual budget not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may extend the 60-day notification period, with the prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That up to \$75,000,000 shall be available only: (1) for adjustments in the allocations for public housing agencies, after application for an adjustment by a public housing agency, that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs of vouchers resulting from unforeseen circumstances or from portability under section 8(r) of the Act; (2) for vouchers that

were not in use during the 12-month period in order to be available to meet a commitment pursuant to section 8(o)(13) of the Act; (3) for adjustments for costs associated with HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) vouchers; and (4) for adjustments in the allocations for public housing agencies that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs as a result of participation in the Small Area Fair Market Rent demonstration: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall allocate amounts under the previous proviso based on need as determined by the Secretary;

(2) \$75,000,000 shall be for section 8 rental assistance for relocation and replacement of housing units that are demolished or disposed of pursuant to section 18 of the Act, conversion of section 23 projects to assistance under section 8, the family unification program under section 8(x) of the Act, relocation of witnesses in connection with efforts to combat crime in public and assisted housing pursuant to a request from a law enforcement or prosecution agency, enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act, HOPE VI vouchers, mandatory and voluntary conversions, and tenant protection assistance including replacement and relocation assistance or for project-based assistance to prevent the displacement of unassisted elderly tenants currently residing in section 202 properties financed between 1959 and 1974 that are refinanced pursuant to Public Law 106-569, as amended, or under the authority as provided under this Act: *Provided*, That when a public housing development is submitted for demolition or disposition under section 18 of the Act, the Secretary may provide section 8 rental assistance when the units pose an imminent health and safety risk to residents: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may only provide replacement vouchers for units that were occupied within the previous 24 months that cease to be available as assisted housing, subject only to the availability of funds: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this paragraph, \$10,000,000 may be available to provide tenant protection assistance, not otherwise provided under this paragraph, to residents residing in low-vacancy areas and who may have to pay rents greater than 30 percent of household income, as the result of (1) the maturity of a HUD-insured, HUD-held or section 202 loan that requires the permission of the Secretary prior to loan prepayment; (2) the expiration of a rental assistance contract for which the tenants are not eligible for enhanced voucher or tenant protection assistance under existing law; or (3) the expiration of affordability restrictions accompanying a mortgage or preservation program administered by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That such tenant protection assistance made available under the previous proviso may be provided under the authority of section 8(t) or section 8(o)(13) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(t)): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall issue guidance to implement the previous provisos, including, but not limited to, requirements for defining eligible at-risk households within 120 days of the enactment of this Act;

(3) \$1,575,000,000 shall be for administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the section 8 tenant-based rental assistance program, of which up to \$50,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary to allocate to public housing agencies that need additional funds to administer their section 8 programs, including fees associated with section 8 tenant protection rental assistance, the administration of disaster-related vouchers, Veterans Affairs Sup-

portive Housing vouchers, and other special purpose incremental vouchers: *Provided*, That no less than \$1,525,000,000 of the amount provided in this paragraph shall be allocated to public housing agencies for the calendar year 2013 funding cycle based on section 8(q) of the Act (and related Appropriation Act provisions) as in effect immediately before the enactment of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-276): *Provided further*, That if the amounts made available under this paragraph are insufficient to pay the amounts determined under the previous proviso, the Secretary may decrease the amounts allocated to agencies by a uniform percentage applicable to all agencies receiving funding under this paragraph or may, to the extent necessary to provide full payment of amounts determined under the previous proviso, utilize unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryovers, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading from prior fiscal years, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That all public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall be funded pursuant to their MTW agreements, and shall be subject to the same uniform percentage decrease as under the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That amounts provided under this paragraph shall be only for activities related to the provision of tenant-based rental assistance authorized under section 8, including related development activities;

(4) \$60,000,000 shall be available for family self-sufficiency coordinators under section 23 of the Act;

(5) \$111,335,000 for the renewal of tenant-based assistance contracts under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), including necessary administrative expenses;

(6) \$75,000,000 for incremental rental voucher assistance for use through a supported housing program administered in conjunction with the Department of Veterans Affairs as authorized under section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make such funding available, notwithstanding section 204 (competition provision) of this title, to public housing agencies that partner with eligible VA Medical Centers or other entities as designated by the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, based on geographical need for such assistance as identified by the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, public housing agency administrative performance, and other factors as specified by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in consultation with the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive, or specify alternative requirements for (in consultation with the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs), any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development administers in connection with the use of funds made available under this paragraph (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment), upon a finding by the Secretary that any such waivers or alternative requirements are necessary for the effective delivery and administration of such voucher assistance: *Provided further*, That assistance made available under this paragraph shall continue to remain available for homeless veterans upon turn-over; and

(7) The Secretary shall separately track all special purpose vouchers funded under this heading.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 75, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$460,000,000)”.

Page 75, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$460,000,000)”.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1310

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, we spend a lot of time talking about how we need to do more with less. The reality is that, all too often, we do less with less. This is the unfortunate reality facing our rental assistance programs if the House-proposed funding levels are enacted.

The Housing Choice Voucher program, more commonly known as section 8, provides rental assistance to over 2 million households with very low incomes. Half of these households are of seniors or people with disabilities. Most of the rest are of families with children.

Experts agree with HUD's assessment of section 8. It is a cost-effective means of delivering decent, safe, and affordable housing to low-income families in the private market. Because of the widely accepted success of the program, section 8 has enjoyed bipartisan support for many years.

Despite agreement among policy experts and politicians, section 8 funding levels continue to come up short of the actual need. The National Low Income Housing Coalition found that, according to the latest census data, for every 100 households with extremely low incomes, only 30 rental units are affordable and available. Three-quarters of renters with extremely low incomes pay housing costs that exceed half of their incomes, placing them at a high risk of housing instability and homelessness. Yet, because of limited funds, only one in four eligible families receives rental assistance.

Without increasing funds beyond what is included in this bill for the section 8 program, an estimated 58,000 low-income families will lose their existing rental assistance next year, putting these families at risk of homelessness. Even the more conservative estimate of the section 8 budget shortfall by the OMB finds that 30,000 low-income families will be at risk of losing their current vouchers and, therefore, of losing their homes.

With housing instability and homelessness comes the destabilizing of families and the possible long-term negative impacts on kids. That's why I'm offering this amendment.

This amendment would increase funding for section 8 voucher renewals

by \$460 million to cover the actual costs of ensuring that existing vouchers will continue and that no family will lose an existing section 8 voucher. This does not increase the number of vouchers, though I would love to do that, but it does ensure that no families would lose their currently existing section 8 vouchers.

Additionally, by funding section 8 at the figures necessary to continue existing vouchers, we can make sure that it would be unnecessary for HUD to implement its proposal for \$75 minimum rent even if that \$75 exceeds the normal section 8 rental limit of 30 percent of income. To most of us here, \$75 may not seem like a lot of money as it's a meal for two in many Washington and New York City restaurants, but for 500,000 of the poorest HUD-assisted families, families who have annual incomes of less than \$3,000—that's around \$250 a month—\$75 is a lot of money. For 400,000 HUD-assisted families, \$75 minimum would be a 50 percent rent increase from what they're paying now, leaving these families with less money for food, transportation, and other basic necessities. We're talking about families with annual incomes of \$2,000 or \$2,500 annually.

Madam Chairman, our first objective must be to prevent further hardship to the poorest people in our country and to prevent additional potential homelessness among vulnerable low-income families. To do this, we must ensure that we do not lose current section 8 assistance and that we do not impose a new minimum rent that could be way beyond 30 percent of income for people earning \$2,000 and \$2,500. This amendment is necessary in order to do that, so I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, which states:

It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, the necessity for this amendment is undeniable.

The hardship and the suffering this budget would cause without this amendment, by imposing minimum rentals way beyond 30 percent of in-

come on people with incomes of \$2,000 to \$2,500 annually, is undeniable. That this Congress should do such a thing is regrettable, to put it mildly.

I understand the rule. The rule would require an offset of an equal amount of money; but in this overly restrictive bill to start with, there is no way of finding such an offset of that amount of money without hurting people in an equal fashion in other ways. So that says that we have a choice of really injuring "these" people or of really injuring "those" people. It's not an acceptable choice. I understand the rule. That is regrettable.

I hope that as we progress with this budget that we can find a way of finding the funds that we have in this amendment for this purpose so that we do not injure all of these thousands and thousands of very low-income people.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York violates section 3(j)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(j)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

The Chair has been persuasively guided by an estimate from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND (RESCISSION)

Unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading, the heading, "Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing", and the heading "Project-Based Rental Assistance", for fiscal year 2013 and prior years may be used for renewal of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts and for performance-based contract administrators, notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds were appropriated: *Provided*, That any obligated balances of contract authority from fiscal year 1974 and prior that have been terminated shall be rescinded: *Provided further*, That amounts previously recaptured, or recaptured during the current fiscal year, from section 8 project-based contracts from source years fiscal year 1975 through fiscal year 1987 are hereby rescinded, and an amount of additional new budget authority, equivalent to the amount permanently cancelled is hereby appropriated, to remain available until expended, for the purposes set forth under this heading, in addition to amounts otherwise available.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

For the Public Housing Capital Fund Program to carry out capital and management activities for public housing agencies, as authorized under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g) (the "Act") \$1,985,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, during fiscal year 2013 the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not delegate to any Department official

other than the Deputy Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing any authority under paragraph (2) of section 9(j) regarding the extension of the time periods under such section: *Provided further*, That for purposes of such section 9(j), the term "obligate" means, with respect to amounts, that the amounts are subject to a binding agreement that will result in outlays, immediately or in the future: *Provided further*, That up to \$15,345,000 shall be to support the ongoing Public Housing Financial and Physical Assessment activities of the Real Estate Assessment Center (REAC): *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary to make grants, notwithstanding section 204 of this Act, to public housing agencies for emergency capital needs including safety and security measures necessary to address crime and drug-related activity as well as needs resulting from unforeseen or unpreventable emergencies and natural disasters excluding Presidentially declared emergencies and natural disasters under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) occurring in fiscal year 2013: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading \$50,000,000 shall be for supportive services, service coordinator and congregate services as authorized by section 34 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437z-6) and the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.): *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$5,000,000 is to support the costs of administrative and judicial receiverships: *Provided further*, That from the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary shall provide bonus awards in fiscal year 2013 to public housing agencies that are designated high performers.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF
GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 84, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$110,000,000)".

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$110,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, the underlying bill is suggesting that Congress allot an increase of \$110 million in Federal funding for the Public Housing Capital Fund from this fiscal year, from fiscal year 2012.

My amendment would simply freeze funding at our current level and reduce the proposed funding by \$110 million. We've got to stop spending. That's what all my efforts are geared towards. We can continue to perform the necessary functions of the Federal Government for those who need it. My amendment would just freeze the proposed increase in funding so that we keep it at this current year's level.

I urge my colleagues to support this very simple amendment, which would save over \$110 million for the hard-working taxpayers of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLIVER. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. The amendment that the gentleman from Georgia has now offered has to do with the Public Housing Capital Fund.

The public housing infrastructure currently has an estimated \$26 billion of maintenance backlog. In fact, capital repairs accumulate at the rate of something over \$3 billion a year, which is considerably higher than \$1.9 billion that is contained in this—\$1.985 billion that's contained in this bill. So what we are doing is, year by year, continuing to provide maintenance funding: the replacement of utilities, the replacement of appliances, as well as such simple maintenance as painting if it's needed, and so on.

□ 1320

In our more than a million housing units, in the 3,500 or so of our total housing authorities around the country, we are steadily putting these in a situation where we're building a further capital maintenance backlog gap year by year by year.

This is never a wise thing to do when it's at the extent that we are presently doing it. But the \$110 million at least is a little bit better than not having the \$110 million, which would be an even greater increase in the backlog gap that we have for maintenance, repair, and upgrading of our housing units.

All of those housing units are intended to last for many years and be used long into the future. If we don't maintain them properly in a reasonable way, then eventually we will lose those units. It is much more expensive to replace the units with new units than it is to maintain them in a proper way.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment so that we do not continue to dig our hole deeper on the maintenance needs for the stock of housing that we have in our 3,500 public housing authorities around the country.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in support of this amendment. This is a \$110 million increase in spending, and it is simply too much under the circumstances.

I want to first of all, though, certainly commend Chairman LATHAM and all those who have worked on this bill because the material that has been provided to our office said that this bill overall contains a 7.1 percent decrease in funding, which I think is the biggest cut of any appropriations bill that we've dealt with so far. I also want to commend and salute the gentleman from Georgia for trying even harder to rein in spending, because I think almost everyone on both sides of the aisle knows that we have to reduce spending and we have to do more than we've been doing.

This \$110 million increase is double the rate of inflation. The amendment by the gentleman from Georgia does not reduce the funding of this agency. It just holds it at the same level. We've cut our own budgets, Madam Chairwoman, for the last couple of years. We've tried to cut many other things. But megabillions have been poured into this program over the last 10 or 15 years. Even with the gentleman's amendment, this fund will still get \$1.765 billion. I can tell you most people around the country think that's an awful lot of money.

I rise in support of this amendment. I certainly hope that if this amendment does not pass, that we will at least pass the much smaller cut in the gentleman's next amendment. But I think this is a good amendment.

We have to get serious about cutting spending when we're facing a national debt of over \$16 trillion, which is going much higher and much faster. Unless we want this country to become a gigantic Greece and have the problems that we're seeing all over the world, then we've got to do more than we're doing.

So I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back that balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

We have been fiscally responsible in this bill by reducing the public housing capital fund by \$85 million below the budget request, and we're hearing that this funding level will be a challenge because there's a backlog, Madam Chairman, of over \$25 billion in capital projects. However, this does represent one of the toughest choices we've had to make to meet our allocation in this bill. A deeper cut to this account will merely defer projects to future years and I believe will cost more money in the future by running up the cost of those projects in the years ahead.

With that, I would urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I was going to introduce another amendment to this same program which would have been a decrease

of just 10 percent of the increase. As I see things going on here today, we can't even cut out \$115,000. Cutting out \$11 million, I'm sure, is out of the question for my colleagues.

Madam Chair, we've just got to stop this outrageous spending here in Washington. So I'm not going to offer the other one. I would anticipate a point of order being brought against it, and rightfully so. So I'm not going to introduce that amendment.

I just ask my colleagues—and I hope that they hear from Americans all over this country—to stop the spending.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

For 2013 payments to public housing agencies for the operation and management of public housing, as authorized by section 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)), \$4,524,000,000: *Provided*, That in determining public housing agencies', including Moving to Work agencies', calendar year 2013 funding allocations under this heading, the Secretary may, contingent on authorization, take into account the impact of changes in minimum rents, flat rents, and medical expense thresholds on public housing agencies' formula income levels.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 86, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$562,150,000)".

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$562,150,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairwoman, the underlying bill increases funding for the public housing operating fund by over \$500 million for fiscal year 2013.

My amendment would simply return the funding back to this year from the proposed levels. It's a \$500 million increase at a time when our Nation is broke and American taxpayers are struggling to put food on their tables and looking for jobs.

It is imperative that we look for commonsense cuts wherever we can, and this is one of those. It's a lot of money, \$500 million. Some would say it's a very small amount compared to the overall funding level proposed in this bill, but it's still \$500 million. We just have to stop spending money that we don't have.

I urge my colleagues to support this very simple amendment that would save over \$500 million, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I do rise in opposition to the gentleman's

amendment. This is an amendment that on face value is somewhat confusing, shall we say.

While it appears that there is a large increase in this account when it says \$562 million over last year, this account is approximately level funded from last year because last year we went in and took \$500 million out of reserve funds of the public housing authorities that were sitting there that were unexpended balances.

□ 1330

Those reserves are no longer there. So what we're having to do in this bill basically to stay virtually even is to have the \$562 million over last year.

This fund provides many of the necessary operating and maintenance activities for our housing authorities, including health, safety, and sanitation. Our funding levels for public housing build in savings from reform proposals that we urge the authorizers to complete before we go to a final conference on this bill. Again, in this entire bill, while you talk about the highway bill, financial services doing their work, but that would be extremely helpful if, in fact, we had authorizations that would actually limit spending and that we could follow.

But again, I just wanted to reiterate: We used \$500 million a year ago out of the funds that were available, sitting there idle. So what, in fact, this does is basically even from last year. While it appears to be a large increase, it, in fact, is not because the use of those funds from last year, the reserve funds.

I believe we are providing a responsible level of funding for this program. And again, I want to reiterate, Madam Chairman, we are cutting about \$4 billion in this appropriation bill—I think the gentleman earlier mentioned that's the largest percentage cut of any bill so far on the floor. But this particular issue, this particular amendment would be extremely devastating because of funding issues in the reserve account that we used last year. With that, I would urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. OLVER. I'm not sure I have anything much to add to what my chairman has said, other than to just point out, if you look back at the number of dollars that were assigned for the fiscal year '11 bill, that was over \$4.6 billion. So in 2012, the amount of money brought that down to under \$4 billion. The \$500-plus million that the gentleman from Iowa had pointed out was part of the reserves that were taken from those housing authorities around the country that had substantial reserves. So that has been done. That was a one-shot kind of a deal. And now the funding has to go back to something that is in line with the yearly fundings, going back to a period of time of well

into a decade ago, that were on a different guide path. So this is just returning to that.

It is at the President's request. It's below the amount that has been granted in the other body's allocation. They had a larger allocation in their numbers for it. This particular account is well below ours. It's \$70 million or so below what has been provided by the chairman in the mark for this year.

So I think this is entirely appropriate, given the size of the maintenance gaps and the need to keep maintaining your facilities, your housing quality so that you don't end up losing that or ending up with much higher expense for replacement. I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS

For the Native American Housing Block Grants program, as authorized under title I of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) (25 U.S.C. 4111 et seq.), \$650,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, to determine the amount of the allocation under title I of such Act for each Indian tribe, the Secretary shall apply the formula under section 302 of such Act with the need component based on single-race census data and with the need component based on multi-race census data, and the amount of the allocation for each Indian tribe shall be the greater of the two resulting allocation amounts: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$2,000,000 shall be contracted for assistance for national or regional organizations representing Native American housing interests for providing training and technical assistance to Indian housing authorities and tribally designated housing entities: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$2,000,000 shall be made available for the cost of guaranteed notes and other obligations, as authorized by title VI of NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such notes and other obligations, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize the total principal amount of any notes and other obligations, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$20,000,000: *Provided further*, That the Department will notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 88, after line 2, insert the following:

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program, as authorized under title VIII of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4221 et seq.), \$13,000,000, to remain available until expended, which amount shall be derived by transfer from the amount provided in this title under "Management and Administration—Administration, Operations, and Management" for the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HANABUSA. My amendment inserts the amount of \$13 million for the Native Hawaiian housing block grant. This is in line with the President's budget. The President provided for the same amount and states that the Native Hawaiian block grant that is authorized under title VIII of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, easier called NAHASDA. The block grant authorizes an annual grant to the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands for housing and housing-related assistance.

Madam Chair, let us understand the significance of this block grant to this Congress and the Nation. In 1921, the Congress passed into law the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. Congress recognized that it was necessary to return Native Hawaiians to their land to support self-sufficiency, and the preservation of their values, traditions, and culture.

Madam Chair, in 1893, when the queen was overthrown, Hawaii was a vibrant, modern nation. And what happened after the overthrow resulted in the need—and Congress saw the need—to look at the return of Native Hawaiians to their lands.

In essence, a trust relationship was created by the creation of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act made very clear that only Hawaiians of 50 percent blood quantum qualify, that the lands could only be leased, not owned, and it also restricted the ability to mortgage and have occupancy restrictions as well.

This block grant assists in fulfilling the special trust relationship which was created and acknowledged in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. It assures the return to the land of Native Hawaiians, which was the concern of Congress. If this provision is authorized and people vote for it, what it will do is it will permit the existing and ongoing projects, along with those planned, to be competed with the ultimate goal of putting Native Hawaiians on the land, which was the purpose of

the trust relationship that we created in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1921.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized program and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. Clause 2 of rule XXI states in pertinent part: "An appropriation may not be in order as an amendment for an expenditure not previously authorized by law."

Madam Chairman, the amendment proposes to appropriate funds for a program that has not been authorized. The amendment, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member seek to be heard on the point of order?

The gentlewoman from Hawaii is recognized.

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chair, I understand the point of order that has been raised. But let me, with all due respect, say that when we look at the language of any rule—the language that is, I guess, suspect here is not previously authorized by law—in fact, as stated by the President, as well as in my amendment, this provision has been authorized by law, and it is found in NAHASDA, title VIII.

□ 1340

When we look at the wording "not previously authorized," the technical argument may be that it was authorized at some point in time and then expired in 2005. However, that is not what the rule says. The rule says: not previously authorized. And this has been previously authorized.

In the recent United States Supreme Court case of *Lamie v. U.S. Trustee*, it's very clear. And we can borrow from the Supreme Court when it gives its opinion as to what it means. The plain language is what controls in any interpretation of any statute or any rule. It is clearly plain language that what is being referred to here is the fact that it was not previously authorized. And it has been previously authorized.

In addition to that, I would also like to say that there is an exception to this rule that says that you can continue appropriations for public works and objects that are already in progress. And to that, Madam Chair, I point out that, as we have said, this money is used for the return of the Native Hawaiians to the lands, and it includes, of course, construction and public works.

They are projects ongoing that need this money in Kakaina, Waimanalo; Piilani Mai ke kai, phase II in Anahola on the island of Kauai; Laiopua on the Big Island on the Kona side; Lalamilo, Waimea; Kanehili, Kapolei; and East Kapolei, II, also in Kapolei, Kapolei being on the island of Oahu.

So on this point of order, Madam Speaker, I believe that it has been mis-

interpreted. The words are "not previously authorized." And in addition to that, this specific provision has been authorized. In addition to that, the exception is for public works projects in progress. And the public works projects are the ones that I have listed, which as we know, is the object of the grant of the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member seek to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I will insist on my point of order. The fact of the matter is this program is not currently authorized. There are no ongoing public works in progress.

So, once again, I would insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The proponent of an item of appropriation carries the burden of persuasion on the question whether it is supported by an authorization in law.

Having reviewed the amendment and entertained arguments on the point of order, the Chair is unable to conclude that the item of appropriation in question is authorized in law. In response to one of the specific arguments. An authorization that has lapsed does not qualify under the rule.

The Chair is therefore constrained to sustain the point of order under clause 2(a) of rule XXI. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND
PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a), \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, up to \$633,000,000: *Provided further*, That up to \$750,000 of this amount may be used for administrative contract expenses including management processes and systems to carry out the loan guarantee program.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH
AIDS

For carrying out the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, as authorized by the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.), \$330,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, except that amounts allocated pursuant to section 854(c)(3) of such Act shall remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall renew all expiring contracts for permanent supportive housing that were funded under section 854(c)(3) of such Act that meet all program requirements before awarding funds for new contracts and activities authorized under this section: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

For assistance to units of State and local government, and to other entities, for eco-

nomie and community development activities, and for other purposes, \$3,404,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, unless otherwise specified: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided, \$3,344,000,000 is for carrying out the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (the "Act" herein) (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.): *Provided further*, That unless explicitly provided for under this heading, not to exceed 20 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated under this heading shall be expended for planning and management development and administration: *Provided further*, That \$60,000,000 shall be for grants to Indian tribes notwithstanding section 106(a)(1) of such Act, of which, notwithstanding any other provision of law (including section 204 of this Act), up to \$3,960,000 may be used for emergencies that constitute imminent threats to health and safety: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used for grants for the Economic Development Initiative ("EDI") or Neighborhood Initiatives activities, Rural Innovation Fund, or for grants pursuant to section 107 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5307): *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 89, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$396,000,000)".

Page 89, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$396,000,000)".

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$396,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I first want to applaud and thank the committee for their work. They've reached the laudable goal of reducing the overall expenditures by \$4 billion. And that is much appreciated and noted. I just happen to think we can do just a little bit better.

I'm looking at the committee report regarding the committee's recommendation on the Community Development Fund, specifically the Community Development Block Grants. And I read:

"This is \$396 million above both fiscal year 2012 and the budget request."

So you have the President making a budget request, and you have last year's expenditures. What this amendment does is reduces by \$396 million to get it back to where we were. Again, I think the President is even also on the same page.

Now, Madam Chair, we have to recognize what a dire financial strait we're in in this country. We have to understand that we have a multitrillion-dollar challenge. We talk about a trillion with a capital T and it's hard to get your arms around it. But if you were to spend a million dollars a day everyday, it would take you almost 3,000 years to get to \$1 trillion.

So when we're racking up a trillion-plus-dollar deficit each year, when our

national debt at the end of this year will approach \$16 trillion, when we're spending more than \$600 million a day in interest on our national debt, we're going to have to cut some spending.

To actually bring back and reduce this to the proper level, I think would be more appropriate. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment. It returns the funding to the fiscal year 2012 level. Again, as the committee report says, this is \$396 million above both fiscal year 2012 and the budget request. I think this is reasonable. I hope the committee would find a place where we can join on this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chair, this is an amendment that would take a huge chunk out of the CDBG program. This is one of the areas in which I have been particularly, I thought, most commendable about what the chairman's mark is in the bill for the CDBG.

The CDBG is a hugely popular program in communities around the country. We have, as I have mentioned in my opening remarks at the beginning of this bill, 65 percent of our population living in communities in metropolitan areas with over half a million people, and close to 90 percent of our people live in communities with over 50,000 people. It's roughly around 50,000 people that are entitlement communities and get an amount of money that they may use in a flexible kind of a way in their cities and towns of large size, and can directly get that money to use for things that they need in their cities. Their cities and towns have suffered greatly in the Great Recession that we have had before us, and they have housing needs which are very substantial.

Now I would point out to the gentleman from Utah that the amount for the CDBG program as proposed by Chairman LATHAM I am commending him for and strongly support his allocation for this. The amount that he has provided in this bill within the allocation and with the \$4 billion reduction that the bill entails is below the number that CDBG was given all the way back in 2008. It has varied up and down, depending upon the allocations and depending upon what has gone on. But this one still is below. And I strongly support it and would urge that it be maintained.

And by the way, about 20 percent of the whole amount goes directly to States, which then can use it in a discretionary way in groups of smaller communities. So it actually gets into rural areas and small communities—in communities like those of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, whose district has no community larger than about 15,000 people. But his district manages to get a considerable amount of money through the State of

Kentucky for the congressional district.

□ 1350

So it is something that goes to everybody in their districts in a flexible way for things that are eligible under the law.

But when it is being used for the development of housing, then it ends up clearly directly providing for jobs. If it's used in the way of social services through nonprofit organizations, again it is providing jobs for people who are doing great service for our population. So I'm a strong supporter of this.

I certainly urge that the amendment be defeated, and I will stop there because other people wish to speak, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I will be brief because I know we have many more amendments to consider, but I want to focus on this one because I think this proposal to cut the Community Development Block Grant program by \$396 million is particularly ill-advised, and I suspect Members on both sides of the aisle will understand that and will agree. We are all, after all, hearing from our mayors and from our local communities with great regularity that CDBG is money well spent.

First of all, this program has been much better funded in past years. Even with the increase in the current bill, for which we commend the chairman, even with that, the funding is much less than could be utilized.

We know the CDBG program has some very strong virtues. One of them is flexibility and community self-determination in terms of how this money is spent, how it is applied, and the kind of leverage that this money represents, for bringing forth participation and funding from other sources.

This is a program that has stood the test of time, that has strong bipartisan support in this Chamber and across the country. So I think the notion that we would cut back this appropriation by hundreds of millions of dollars is most unwise, and I urge defeat of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Community Development Block Grant program is very important to cities and States across the country. There is a great deal of local control in this program. Communities use the block grants to meet local needs such as building water and sewer infrastructure, community centers, housing for low-income families, and other devel-

opment important to their local communities. Although the bill increases the funding, this funding level is still well below what it was in fiscal year 2010. The bill actually is \$1.046 billion below the level of 2010, to be exact.

Madam Chair, as we were going through this bill, we had many Members on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, request additional funding for these grants. For many Members, there is strong constituent support for these programs. We have seen individual cases of abuse, not unlike a lot of other government programs, but really the way to fix those reforms, and we're not going to do it through the appropriations process, is through the authorizers, to have them do their work and make sure that these programs are well run, that they're focused and they actually do what the intention is.

Again, I want everybody to understand that we are actually below fiscal year 2010 levels on a very, very important program, and I would recommend and urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 89, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced to \$0)".

Page 89, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced to \$0)".

Page 89, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced to \$60,000,000)".

Page 90, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced to \$3,960,000)".

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,404,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, this amendment finishes the good work begun by the gentleman from Utah on the previous amendment. It saves \$3.4 billion by eliminating all funding for the Community Development Block Grant program.

This program was created in 1974 with the stated objective of eliminating blight and providing affordable housing, but in the nearly four decades since then, it has degenerated into a Federal slush fund for pet projects of local politicians and politically connected businesses. It is plagued by profigate waste and outright fraud.

This is an unauthorized expenditure. The legal authority for it expired back in 1994, 18 years ago, and Congress has not bothered to renew it ever since, but we keep shoveling money at it year after year. Madam Chair, \$3.5 billion averages to almost \$50 from the earnings of a family of four, and they have a right to know where their \$50, taken from their family budgets, is going.

Senator COBURN gave some examples in his Back to Black report: Summit County, Ohio, spent \$100,000 of CDBG funds to create a doggie daycare and kennel last year, and Nyack, New York, directed \$10,000 of CDBG funds to Amazing Grace Circus in 2009 to put on "A Day At the Circus."

CDBG funds are being spent creating a "hip" atmosphere for employees of an L.A. architectural firm, providing decorative sidewalks in a wealthy Virginia community, and upgrading Victorian cottages in Alabama. Indeed, some communities use these funds to pay off Federal loans they've taken out on projects that are now defaulting because they've utterly failed to produce all of the benefits they've promised.

Even in the best of circumstances, these are all projects that exclusively benefit local communities or private interests and ought to be paid for exclusively by those local communities or private interests. They are of such questionable merit that no city council is willing to face its constituents and say, This is how we have spent your local taxes. But they are more than happy to spend somebody else's Federal taxes, so we end up robbing St. Petersburg to pay St. Paul for projects so dubious that the purported beneficiaries won't pay for them.

And that's all before we discuss the realm of fraud. This program is replete with individuals directing six-figure sums to their personal bank accounts or political activities. The Office of Management and Budget has repeatedly branded this program as "ineffective." That's its official designation for government programs that cannot ascertain how their funds are spent. HUD's own inspector general found that, in a relatively short 2-year time-span, over 150 criminal indictments were issued for false claims, bribery, fraudulent contracts, theft, embezzlement, or corruption in connection with this program.

This a slush fund that cries for abolition, and it should be one of the first places that we look to bring spending under control and stop wasting our constituents' money. Once again, though, this unauthorized program is not targeted for elimination by the Appropriations Committee. It is not even targeted for a token reduction in spending. As we just discussed, the Appropriations Committee proposes spending \$400 million more than we spent last year, indeed, \$400 million more than even the President requested.

Now, let's be very clear on this. The House Appropriations Committee, with

a Republican majority that has a clear mandate to stop wasting money, is about to appropriate \$400 million more than requested by the most spendthrift administration in our Nation's history on a program with no Federal nexus, with a solid history of fraud, and that funds the most unworthy of local projects and special interest handouts.

□ 1400

The rules of the House were specifically written to prevent this type of unauthorized expenditure, and they provide for a point of order to be raised if it's included in an appropriations bill. That is exactly what we have here. But, alas, that rule is routinely waived when these measures are brought to the floor, making this amendment necessary.

Madam Chairwoman, this is another critical test of the Republican majority's intention to stand by the promises it made to the American people in the most dangerous fiscal crisis in our Nation's history. I pray that we rise to the occasion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I believe, with the offering of this amendment, we are in great need of a reality check in this Chamber. After all, it was President Nixon, and it was a strong, bipartisan majority, with the Republicans playing a leading role, that first initiated the Community Development Block Grant programs, and I assume that this amendment will be rejected today by that same kind of bipartisan coalition.

The whole idea of the CDBG program was to get away from inflexible, one-size-fits-all approaches to urban development. The whole idea was to get away from top-down bureaucratic direction. CDBG was designed to empower communities, to give them flexibility, to maximize the possibility for leverage of private sector funds, to let the community determine its own projects and its own priorities.

All of us have experience with this program, I dare say. My experience has been that the bang for the buck from CDBG is virtually unmatched in any other Federal program. Housing rehabilitation, for example, is one of the main uses in many communities of CDBG funds. What you're doing with housing rehabilitation is not building public housing from scratch. You're not totally developing new neighborhoods, but you're taking houses that are likely to deteriorate, where a relatively small investment can rehab those houses, can salvage those houses, and can make quality housing available more widely in the community.

Another major use of CDBG funds is infrastructure. How many Habitat for Humanity communities have been built

across our country with CDBG funds furnishing the basic infrastructure, and from there the volunteer efforts take off?

The gentleman sponsoring this amendment made the incredible statement that these are projects that communities wouldn't undertake on their own. On the contrary, no CDBG project is going to be undertaken without community participation, financial and otherwise, without community self-determination that this is a priority.

So there's an air of unreality about this debate. These are programs that maximize the values that many of our colleagues profess—self-determination, flexibility, leveraging of private funds. They're programs that have stood the test of time. And we, in this bill, should be proud to appropriate CDBG funds, because we know these funds will have great multiplier effects throughout this country. So I very strongly urge colleagues to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I rise to oppose the amendment—the same, basically, that I said before: we are below fiscal year 2010 levels. Certainly, I believe the authorizing committee must set very strict parameters as to how these dollars should be used, but we are below fiscal year 2010, and I would urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED
BY MR. DIAZ-BALART

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 90, line 12, before the period insert the following:

Provided further, That unless explicitly provided for under this heading, not to exceed 25 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated under this heading may be expended for public services (as such term is defined for purposes of section 105 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305))

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that this amendment is subject to a point of order, but I'd like to discuss what this amendment is attempting to address.

As we all know, the Community Development Block Grant program, which is known as the CDBG grant program, is one of the most widely utilized sources of assistance by local governments. These block grants are intended to address housing, community development and economic development needs as determined by local officials.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is very straightforward. It simply gives greater flexibility to the local communities and the cities and the counties, et cetera, for part of their CDBG funding. It increases the cap of what is known as public services expenditures from the current 15 percent up to 25 percent.

Now, public services, in reference to this legislation, deals with issues like child care, senior services, disabled services, educational programs, medical services, transportation services, domestic violence, crime prevention, food banks, and others.

The current 15 percent public service cap was enacted into statute over 30 years ago; and it, frankly, just doesn't reflect the reality of today. We all acknowledge, obviously, the tremendous fiscal challenges that we are facing here in Congress, that our country is facing; but we also acknowledge, Mr. Chairman, the challenges that our local communities are facing.

CDBG public services funds have really played a key role in providing crucial aid to our most at-risk, our most vulnerable populations, especially during difficult times like these. The restrictive and, frankly, outdated cap has denied many communities, Mr. Chairman, the option of providing their residents with the most basic services within the framework of the existing CDBG program. So this amendment provides flexibility to local leaders to meet certain unique challenges.

Now, I want to make something very clear: this amendment does not increase or decrease CDBG funds, does not change the formula, and does not require those communities that are entitled to use more of their funds on public services. It simply grants those cities and counties greater flexibility in their usage of certain CDBG funds. Let me mention that my colleague, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, has a standalone piece of legislation that I'm honored to be a cosponsor of.

It's imperative that the authorizing committee, the Financial Services Committee, work to update the CDBG program—for a lot of reasons. I also need to mention that Chairman LATHAM is well aware of these concerns. I want to thank him and his staff for really trying to accommodate us on this issue, but unfortunately we were not able to do it at this time for a number of different reasons. I'd like to continue to work with Chairman

LATHAM and the Financial Services chairman, Chairman BACHUS, on finding real solutions that will give local communities flexibility to meet their unique challenges and to make sure that those funds are well utilized.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Diaz-Balart amendment and to draw attention to a crisis that will soon hit the city of Miami and many other cities throughout south Florida, our State of Florida, and indeed throughout the Nation.

We are all aware of the difficult funding decisions that will need to be made by many departments and programs. Programs like the Community Development Block Grant may see overall reductions because of the sad realities of the current budget constraints and in the interest of fiscal responsibility. However, because of an arbitrary Community Development Block Grant expenditure cap, countless vulnerable citizens in the city of Miami and throughout the United States will lose their only means of sustenance.

□ 1410

This amendment is not about increased funding, Mr. Chairman, nor is it about changing the overall formula of the Community Development Block Grant. It is simply about providing greater flexibility to cities on how they allocate their CDBG funds. Currently, only 15 percent of Community Development Block Grant funds can go toward public services.

Now, what are public services? Well, they include food for senior citizens, the disabled, the homeless, the abused, or neglected children. They also may be used for child care, for health services, for job training services.

The city of Miami, which I am proud to represent, currently provides these vital services, especially meals, through the current Community Development Block Grant public services. But, because of the overall decrease in CDBG allocations, many disadvantaged men, women, and children will be without the vital support that they deserve and need.

This amendment is simply a painless solution to this development, allowing cities the flexibility they need in how they expand their CDBG funds. It would allow up to 25 percent of CDBG funds to go to public services, a position that has been endorsed by the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities.

The current 15 percent public service expenditure cap was enacted with the original statute over 30 years ago. It does not reflect the evolution of this program, nor the necessity to provide flexibility to local leaders on how funds should be expended during this

time of belt tightening. The current restrictive and outdated limit has denied many communities the option of providing their residents with the most basic and necessary services within the framework established by the program.

CDBG public services have played a key role in providing crucial aid to our most at-risk and vulnerable constituents, especially during this enduring recession. Cities across our country have had to do more with less, and this amendment will help them accomplish just that.

I wish to thank Chairman LATHAM and his staff for working with Congressman DIAZ-BALART and me on trying to give this flexibility through the proper channel to our local leaders.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. LATHAM. I do.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I just want to make the point that I want to continue to work with these two great Members from Florida. It is a real problem for the community, and I will do everything possible to try to be of assistance with addressing this real problem for them.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Miami.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, again, want to thank you and your staff, who have been great on this issue, understanding the problem.

At this time I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, HUD, and Related Agencies, Mr. LATHAM, and also with Mr. WOLF on the Driver Alcohol Detection System for Safety, or DADSS.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the chairman. As the gentlemen are aware, the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration, NHTSA, has been working on a public-private research program known as the Driver Alcohol Detection System for Safety, or DADSS, that would develop a passive technology to detect if a driver's

blood alcohol content is above the legal limit.

I would urge the chairman to consider funding for the DADSS program as this bill moves forward, and I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, and rise to support his initiative.

Mr. Chairman, too many times a mother or a father or a loved one has gotten that dreaded call in the middle of the night that someone has been killed in an accident involving a drunk driver. And I appreciate my friend from Maryland raising the DADSS program, and also urge my good friend, the chairman, to look at this program as the bill moves forward.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentlemen from Maryland and Virginia. I appreciate their taking the time to raise this very important issue. I will be mindful of their concerns as the process moves forward.

Mr. SARBANES. I appreciate it, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEES
PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, \$6,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, as authorized by section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5308): *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$244,000,000, notwithstanding any aggregate limitation on outstanding obligations guaranteed in section 108(k) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR.
MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 90, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced to \$0)”.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$6,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment eliminates funding for the Community Development loan guarantee program. Like the Community Development Block Grants that we just discussed, these loan guarantees support strictly local projects that have no Federal nexus.

Now, unlike the House Appropriations Committee, President Obama has requested no taxpayer subsidies for this program, and that’s a pretty profound statement. Remember, this is

the same President who had no problem placing billions of taxpayer dollars at risk for failed schemes like Solyndra, for which he was soundly and rightly criticized by many in this House.

But even the architect of the Solyndra fiasco is unwilling to risk taxpayer money on this loan guarantee program, so, enter the House Appropriations Committee that apparently has money to burn.

What are the recent projects funded by these loan guarantees? Well, \$7 million went to the city of Hartford to buy a 393-room Hilton Hotel; \$15 million went to build a movie studio in Norristown, Pennsylvania; a \$10 million loan to Bass Pro Shops to redevelop the Memphis Pyramid.

Now, why would we put our taxpayers’ money at risk for these ventures? Obviously, private investors were unwilling to risk their own money. Obviously, President Obama sees these loans as far riskier than anything that he’s loaned in the Solyndra fiasco. But we’re about to put our constituents’ hard-earned money at risk to prop up these projects.

Now, when Bass Pro Shops takes \$10 million to redevelop the Memphis Pyramid, will this mean more jobs in Memphis? Well, yes. And will it mean precisely that many fewer jobs in other regions as, once again, we take from one community to give to another? Unfortunately, the answer is yes to that question as well.

My amendment simply takes taxpayer exposure to these risky loans down to the level of fiscal restraint proposed by the least fiscally restrained President in the history of our Nation. I’d invite my Republican colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to follow.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, here we have kind of the yang that went with the yin. The gentleman’s amendment here a few minutes ago, the last one that he offered, was \$3.5 billion, and taking that out of this allocation.

□ 1420

In this case, it’s a \$6 million amount. That’s about 5,000 times as much as the six. The first was 5,000 times as much as this one. Maybe I’m off by an order of magnitude. I’m not quite sure.

The gentleman from California has pointed out that the President did not want to do this at all. Well, actually, the President had asked the committee to create a user fee to pay for this rather than the mechanism by which this really very small program—this \$6 million program of loan guarantees—has been functioning, which was to pay for any risk involved. The gentleman is claiming, if there were any serious risk, that it should be paid for out of

the subsequent years’ allocations under CDBG.

It turns out, for those places that would use this program, the loan guarantee program, there has never been a penny lost of the Federal taxpayers on any of the section 108 projects that we have issued in this program, and there have been a number of them. It actually is one of the most flexible. The Community Development loan guarantee program is exceedingly flexible and very creative. It has been used to create larger projects, projects that create jobs and that may be part of the revitalization of a whole target area, and it always ends up bringing in substantial additional private investment into the neighborhood.

So it’s creating jobs. It is used often for the reuse of old factory buildings that are no longer viable in the forms that they were. Particularly in my part of the country, it has been used in that kind of a way—and successfully—to make a project that may turn out to be housing, that may turn out to be a business incubator or whatever. This is a very flexible program and one that the Federal taxpayer has never lost money on.

The creation of jobs and the development of new businesses that come into a place that may be part of a development of this sort is what gives us a robust economy. A robust economy is the best way we have of reducing the deficit because you can end up cutting and cutting and cutting programs, and if you do not end up creating jobs in the long run, you’re simply not going to return to a robust economy. I think we know that.

So I rise in opposition to this amendment. I think it is a counterproductive thing to do. It’s very small. It has never lost any money. It operates quite well. The chairman, with my assent—though he didn’t need my assent—certainly left it in there. I support his position very strongly, and I urge the defeat of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. WOMACK. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I also oppose the amendment.

The Community Development Block Grant program is very important to cities and States throughout our country. As a former mayor, I can attest to the fact of the impact the Community Development Block Grants have on our local communities. This year, we had many Members, both Republicans and Democrats, request funding for CDBG programs. For many Members, there is strong constituent support for the program.

The section 108 CDBG loan guarantee is a good community development tool because it does something that we should be interested in doing, and that is leveraging funding. With only \$6 million provided in the bill, HUD is able to

make nearly a quarter of a billion dollars in loan guarantees for community development. So it's a small amount of Federal money that creates a pretty significant impact. Now, if a fee is warranted, we would encourage the authorizing committee to enact legislation to create a fee and lower the cost of the program.

So I urge a "no" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

For the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, \$1,200,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the amount made available under this heading, the threshold reduction requirements in sections 216(10) and 217(b)(4) of such Act shall not apply to allocation of such amount: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading used for projects not completed within 4 years of the commitment date, as determined by a signature of each party to the agreement, shall be repaid: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may extend the deadline for 1 year if the Secretary determines that the failure to complete the project is beyond the control of the participating jurisdiction: *Provided further*, That no funds provided under this heading may be committed to any project included as part of a participating jurisdiction's plan under section 105(b), unless each participating jurisdiction certifies that it has conducted an underwriting review, assessed developer capacity and fiscal soundness, and examined neighborhood market conditions to ensure adequate need for each project: *Provided further*, That any homeownership units funded under this heading which cannot be sold to an eligible homeowner within 6 months of project completion shall be rented to an eligible tenant: *Provided further*, That no funds provided under this heading may be awarded for development activities to a community housing development organization that cannot demonstrate that it has staff with demonstrated development experience: *Provided further*, That funds provided in prior appropriations Acts for technical assistance, that were made available for Community Housing Development Organizations technical assistance, and that still remain available, may be used for HOME technical assistance notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 91, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$200,000,000)".

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$200,000,000)".

Mr. FLAKE (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut \$200 million from the HOME Investment Partnership and transfer the savings to the deficit reduction account. This simply takes the level of funding to where it was last year.

We are often told we need to cut spending. I think we need to. Yet, with this program, we're actually increasing the funding from \$1 billion to \$1.2 billion, so it's about a 20 percent increase. This is the largest Federal block grant to State and local governments, designed exclusively to create affordable housing for low-income households.

In 2011, a nationwide investigation by The Washington Post described the program as:

a dysfunctional system that delivers billions of dollars to local housing agencies with few rules, safeguards or even a reliable way to track projects.

This was The Washington Post saying this. It wasn't some conservative Republicans. This was The Washington Post. According to The Post:

These lapses have led to widespread misspending and delays in a two-decade-old program meant to deliver decent housing to the working poor. Nearly 700 projects awarded \$400 million have been idling for years while the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has largely looked the other way. It does not track the pace of construction, and it often fails to spot defunct deals. Instead, they're trusting local agencies to police projects.

Again, that was a quote from the investigation.

In 2009–2010, HUD's Office of Inspector General came out with reports that questioned not only HUD's ability to monitor these HOME project funds but also whether the program was in compliance with its own rules. In addition, several Members of Congress have acknowledged concerns about HUD's ability to ensure that HOME funds are used in a way that produce the program's intended results.

The full Financial Services Committee has held congressional hearings in response to these concerns. In a spending bill just last year, Congress included language that placed additional restrictions on the use of HOME funds for FY12. The problem is those are the funds that are being implemented now. We don't even know if they're following the guidelines and are doing what we asked them to do.

Yet here we're appropriating \$200 million more to them rather than saying, Hey, we wanted you to do these things. Let's check and see if you've done them before we award you with more money.

It's difficult to evaluate these projects when they haven't been done yet. That's the reason we ought to cut back and simply go level with the funding of last year. Again, it's not a cut from last year. It's level funding from last year. It's the least we can do when running these kinds of deficits and when we have this kind of debt and when we've found massive, massive problems with this program.

□ 1430

The remedy isn't to award a 20 percent increase. If anything, we ought to be cutting the program. I'm simply saying with this amendment, let's take it back to where it was last year. What is the point of oversight that we exercise here in Congress if we exercise that oversight, we find problems, we ask for a remedy, and then we award money before we even see if the remedy was actually entered into? We have oversight here. We have the power of the purse. Let's use it.

This program is troubled. It has problems. It's not just people on one side of the aisle that recognize that. The Congress as a whole does. So why in the world are we awarding 20 percent more funding this year than we had last year? This amendment would take it back to last year's funding level.

I urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I rise today to speak on the Transportation and Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill on the floor.

First off, I want to say that whether it's the mayor of Jacksonville, Florida; Orlando; California; or Texas, every single mayor that I've talked to—Democrats or Republicans—support Community Development Block Grants and are very concerned with what we're doing here and making sure that we send funds that they can decide how the community is to use the funds to meet their needs.

In addition, I want to talk about transportation. I've been on the Transportation Committee for the entire 20 years that I've been here in Congress, and transportation has always been bipartisan. It did not matter who the President was, and it did not matter who the Speaker was. In fact, when Newt Gingrich was the Speaker and President Clinton was the President, the House passed the transportation bill over both of them and funded the Transportation Committee for 6 years.

This House has not been able to pass a transportation bill. For the first time, you see people who really don't want to put America to work because

the Transportation Committee is the committee that put the American people to work. When you look at the engineers or architects, they rate America as a "D minus," as far as our infrastructure is concerned. Yet you have people that do not want to put the American people back to work.

In my home State of Florida, we received close to \$3 billion for a high-speed train from Orlando to Tampa. What did we do? We sent it back. Eighteen States have our money, and they are putting people to work. We're talking about transportation money.

When you have people with other agendas besides putting people to work, that is a real problem in the area of transportation. We know that for every \$1 billion we invest, it generates 44,000 permanent jobs. Yet you have people in this House with a different agenda, and their agenda has nothing to do with jobs and putting people to work. It is a sad state of affairs. But I've often said you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment that is ostensibly before us.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, we were talking about the amendment that the gentleman from Arizona has offered, and he has offered an amendment that would take \$200 million out of the HOME Investment Partnership program as recommended by Chairman LATHAM and the subcommittee and through the procedures of the subcommittee and the full committee actions before coming to the floor.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. There have been some controversies with the HOME Investment Partnership program; but there were statutory changes last year, and HUD is now in the process of finishing the rule to go along with those statutory changes. So those reforms are now basically in place.

To my understanding, at least, there has been no instance of our actual loss of money from the HOME Partnership program at any time, but there have been projects that have been stalled. This is one of the few programs that we have in this bill that actually results in the construction of housing. Most affordable housing projects use multiple sources to complete a development, and occasionally it is possible that the private development monies don't materialize to a project that has been approved for the HOME Partnership program. If that happens, then HUD takes the money back and uses it someplace else. It doesn't in any way end up resulting in a loss to the taxpayers of the country.

The HOME program is, as I say, one of the few programs that actually funds newly constructed housing under this legislation. These funds are used.

They provide needed jobs in our communities; they ease the unemployment in the construction sector; they produce housing; and they don't end up costing the taxpayers any money.

To the degree that that is followed and we can produce housing, then I am certainly in favor of it and strongly support Chairman LATHAM's assignment of the additional money. I would point out that the level of the funding at the level that has been recommended by the Appropriations Committee and by the subcommittee that Mr. LATHAM chairs, that the amount of money that has been assigned is below the amount that was assigned 5 years ago for the 2008 budget.

We have been through ups and downs on this one over time, and I certainly would urge a "no" vote on the gentleman's amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

□ 1440

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise to associate myself with the remarks of our esteemed ranking member, JOHN OLVER of Massachusetts, and rise to oppose Mr. FLAKE's proposal.

Now, if Mr. FLAKE came to the floor and cut money from well-larded Arizona projects, I might ponder that type of amendment—but I don't support cuts in HOME. With the devastation that's occurred across our housing market, we shouldn't harm housing for sure. But, if he would take the money to balance the budget from the subsidized Central Arizona Water Project, or if he would take the funds from the major Federal monuments that are stacked wall-to-wall in his State of Arizona, or if he would take the funds from all the defense facilities that help to employ and hold up the economy of his State—those might be worthy of debate.

It's very interesting where he cuts money from—from among the poorest areas in this country, some of the most devastated parts of America that are trying to rebuild themselves. It's very curious to me when he proposes amendments, whether it be this one or other ones in subcommittee, he always leaves his home turf sacrosanct.

Mr. FLAKE. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. Yes. I would be interested in the gentleman's response.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio.

For all I know, this cuts money from my district as well. I have not discriminated in where I have taken money from. I think everybody who has followed the process over the past several years knows that.

With regard to the Central Arizona Project, Arizona repays the Federal Government to the tune of about \$55 million a year, still after all these years. The fact that we are 83 percent publicly owned in Arizona means that

our local communities have to run their facilities and run their services on just a narrow sliver of private land.

Ms. KAPTUR. Reclaiming my time, all those loans were subsidized and capital was made available at very favorable terms compared to my region of Arizona. That paid its own way. Just look where federal dollar flow to Arizona—if one looks at the defense bases across northern Ohio, we don't have anything like Arizona has. Defense dollars flow heavily to Arizona. Or, if we look at the kinds of subsidies we are providing for water in the West—The Central Arizona project or for Bureau of Land Management projects, for all of the investments that have been made to allow Arizona to even get water, federal funds have built Arizona—and then to say to the part of the country that said, Well, we want the West to develop. So we're going to help you out. But now you say, No, no, no, no. Now we're going to take money away from Cleveland and Toledo and Detroit and Pittsburgh and Philadelphia and Chicago and Milwaukee—all of the places that taxed themselves for the development of the modern West.

So I would say to the gentleman, I think the answer to the problem we have is economic growth, and we have to invest in that. The housing sector has been dead in the water since 2008, largely because of the nonregulation of the Bush administration during those years when the Wall Street house of cards and derivatives were created. So let's look at what happened back then.

But, please, don't take it out of the hides of the most stressed communities in America that, despite all the odds, are in the process of reinvesting and rebuilding themselves to fuel recovery.

So I just want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER). Oppose the Flake amendment. Support programs that will help the revitalization of the housing sector of this country.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BACHUS

Mr. BACHUS. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 92, line 16, before the period insert the following:

: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$200,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for necessary expenses for

activities authorized under the HOME Investment Partnerships Act (42 U.S.C. 12721 et seq.) related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, restoration of housing and infrastructure, and economic revitalization in the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from a major disaster declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) in 2011: *Provided further*, That such disaster relief funds shall be awarded only to States and units of general local government that were awarded funds under section 239 of Public Law 112-55 (125 Stat. 703), shall be awarded directly to such States and units of general local government at the discretion of the Secretary, and shall be awarded in accordance with such formula or requirements as the Secretary shall establish, except that such formula or requirements shall give preference to awards based on a county's unmet housing needs for renter occupied units: *Provided further*, That prior to the obligation of such disaster relief funds a grantee shall submit a plan to the Secretary detailing the proposed use of all such funds, including criteria for eligibility and how the use of these funds will address long-term recovery and restoration of infrastructure: *Provided further*, That such disaster relief funds may not be used for activities reimbursable by, or for which funds are made available by, the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the Army Corps of Engineers: *Provided further*, That such disaster relief funds allocated under this heading shall not be considered relevant to the other non-disaster formula allocations under this heading: *Provided further*, That a State or subdivision thereof may use up to 5 percent of its allocation of such disaster relief funds for administrative costs: *Provided further*, That in administering such disaster relief funds under this heading, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive, or specify alternative requirements for, any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the obligation by the Secretary or the use by the recipient of these funds or guarantees (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment), upon a request by a State or subdivision thereof explaining why such waiver is required to facilitate the use of such funds or guarantees, if the Secretary finds that such waiver would not be inconsistent with the overall purpose of the HOME Investment Partnerships Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register any waiver of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers pursuant to HOME Investment Partnerships Act no later than 5 days before the effective date of such waiver.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the Bachus amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACHUS. Let me acknowledge the point of order is due to be granted.

I am, however, here to ask for the cooperation of the appropriating committee as we move forward on addressing a problem that we found as a result of the many tornadoes that devastated our country last year. And I will use an example from the city of Tuscaloosa.

In the aftermath of the tornado that struck Tuscaloosa on April 27, HUD came in and calculated the loss of residences and rental units. Part of their charge was to replace the critical

needs. However—and I will just use one census tract as an example—they came into a census tract that includes University Boulevard, which is a census tract made up almost entirely of rental units. However, according to HUD's calculation, they came in and they simply surveyed the owner-occupied units. Now, there were 23 owner-occupied units that were destroyed in the census tract, but there were 440 rental units that were destroyed in this same tract. So almost all the loss of property was rental units. It left the city of Tuscaloosa, a university town, woefully inadequate in its number of rental units.

In their calculation, they only take the owner-occupied units, and they extrapolate from that what they consider the number of rental units to be in that same census tract. Well, you can't really base a calculation of how many rental units there are based on how many owner-occupied dwellings there are. And to tell you how much they missed it, they calculated that there were no rental units destroyed, which is obviously a tremendous miscalculation.

So we've offered an amendment today which essentially will say that you have to consider—and your survey must include—both owner-occupied units and rental units and that you must calculate both of them, not simply the owner-occupied units.

HUD's model, in short, needs to be changed. We believe that our authorizing committee will correct this in future cases, but there's an urgent need to replace the rental housing that was lost in last year's tornadoes throughout the Nation. And my amendment simply creates a mechanism to do so and directs HUD to develop a formula for distributing assistance to communities that have already suffered damage. This will restore what we think is fairness and a more correct calculation.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Thank you for allowing me to explain the purpose of the amendment that my colleague Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL and I are proposing.

Communities in the State of Alabama and other states are still recovering from the devastating tornadoes of April 27, 2011.

A critical issue is replacing rental housing that was destroyed by the tornadoes. Rental housing is an important and affordable option for individuals and families, especially in larger cities.

Unfortunately, the methodology used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to award recovery assistance may be weighted—in some cases—against rebuilding rental housing.

To provide an example, according to a study by the office of Mayor Walt Maddox, one census tract in Tuscaloosa sustained tornado damage to 463 housing units: 23 owner-occupied units and 440 rental units. Rather than document the actual damage and distribute recovery aid accordingly, HUD used a mathematical model to calculate the damage.

The result is that only 2.2% of the units in this devastated neighborhood were deemed to have been severely damaged. None of the rental properties were included in the formula, regardless of their damage.

This bureaucratic discrepancy has put Tuscaloosa and other communities at an unfair disadvantage when it comes to receiving funding for the restoration of their rental housing stock.

HUD's model needs to be changed. We are working to correct it for future cases, but there is an urgent need to replace the rental housing that was lost during last year's tornadoes.

Our amendment creates a mechanism to do that. It directs HUD to develop a formula for distributing assistance to communities that have already suffered damage. This will help restore fairness and promote the continued recovery of our communities from some of the most devastating tornadoes in the history of the State of Alabama and our nation.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

Ms. SEWELL. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Chairman, I understand the point of order; but I rise today in support of this amendment by my fellow colleague from Alabama, which adds critical funding to assist communities devastated as a result of last year's severe weather.

This bipartisan amendment would add \$200 million to the underlying bill and direct it towards communities that received CDBG disaster assistance in FY 2012. Prior to awarding of these new funds, this amendment directs HUD to establish a formula of funding that would give preference to applicants based on a county's unmet housing need, including renter-occupied units.

Currently, there is still an ongoing and urgent need for housing options, particularly rental units, across several parts of my district as well as my colleague's district. This amendment would help communities like Tuscaloosa, Alabama, receive adequate funds to help repair and rebuild the rental housing units that were destroyed by the April 27 tornadoes. This would help to provide rental housing units that will provide critical shelter for women, children, and families.

□ 1450

A recent report released by HUD estimated that the amount of unmet housing needs for Tuscaloosa County alone would exceed \$56 million. Most of this figure was associated with unmet rental housing need.

The devastation and destruction that was caused by the April tornados across the State of Alabama is still being felt, especially in places that already have economically disadvantaged areas. This amendment would provide the additional funds needed for these affected areas to continue their efforts toward full recovery.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SELF-HELP AND ASSISTED HOMEOWNERSHIP
OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program, as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended, \$60,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$20,000,000 shall be made available to the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$35,000,000 shall be made available for the second, third and fourth capacity building activities authorized under section 4(a) of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 9816 note), of which not less than \$5,000,000 may be made available for rural capacity-building activities: *Provided further*, That \$5,000,000 shall be made available for capacity-building activities for national organizations with expertise in rural housing, including experience working with rural housing organizations, local governments, and Indian tribes: *Provided further*, That no funds made available for capacity building activities under this heading in this Act or any prior Act may be set-aside, reserved, or awarded in connection with the Department's demand-response initiative, described in section V(A)(3)(d) of the Notices of Funding Availability for fiscal years 2010, 2011, and 2012: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any requirement in any Notice of Funding Availability, grant application, grant agreement, or work plan, any unexpended amounts provided under this heading for capacity building activities in fiscal years 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013 may not be used in connection with such demand-response initiative or any similar initiative, unless a grantee, in its sole discretion, decides to undertake or continue such a project: *Provided further*, That prior to undertaking, or asking others to undertake, any further demand-response or similar place-based initiatives, the Department shall submit for Congressional approval in its operating plan and budget proposal a detailed justification of such initiative, including how it fits within the Department's overall capacity building efforts, why it is consistent with authorizing legislation, and how the Department plans to implement it effectively.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the emergency solutions grants program as authorized under subtitle B of title

IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended; the continuum of care program as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of such Act; and the rural housing stability assistance program as authorized under subtitle D of title IV of such Act, \$2,000,000,000, of which \$1,995,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, and of which \$5,000,000 shall remain available until expended for project-based rental assistance with rehabilitation projects with 10-year grant terms and any rental assistance amounts that are recaptured under such continuum of care program shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not less than \$286,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for such emergency solutions grants program: *Provided further*, That not less than \$1,650,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for such continuum of care and rural housing stability assistance programs: *Provided further*, That up to \$6,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the national homeless data analysis project: *Provided further*, That all funds awarded for supportive services under the continuum of care program and the rural housing stability assistance program shall be matched by not less than 25 percent in cash or in kind by each grantee: *Provided further*, That for all match requirements applicable to funds made available under this heading for this fiscal year and prior years, a grantee may use (or could have used) as a source of match funds other funds administered by the Secretary and other Federal agencies unless there is (or was) a specific statutory prohibition on any such use of any such funds: *Provided further*, That all awards of assistance under this heading shall be required to coordinate and integrate homeless programs with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs for which homeless populations may be eligible, including Medicaid, State Children's Health Insurance Program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Food Stamps, and services funding through the Mental Health and Substance Abuse Block Grant, Workforce Investment Act, and the Welfare-to-Work grant program: *Provided further*, That all balances for Shelter Plus Care renewals previously funded from the Shelter Plus Care Renewal account and transferred to this account shall be available, if recaptured, for continuum of care renewals in fiscal year 2013: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation from amounts allocated (which may represent initial or final amounts allocated) for the emergency solutions grant program within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF
MICHIGAN

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 94, line 19, after each of the first and second dollar amounts, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 95, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 110, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I offer this amendment on behalf of citizens who feel that they have no voice in this Congress; people who have given up hope altogether. These are citizens who

earn money by scavenging through alleys to find empty bottles and cans and get their return deposits. They survive by rummaging through garbage dumpsters to find food to eat. These are citizens who have no place to live. They're on the street.

According to the Detroit Rescue Mission Ministries, every night in the city of Detroit there are nearly 20,000 people who are in need of shelter and who are homeless. Nearly a quarter of these people are children. And what is perhaps most tragic is that many of these citizens—and I have spoken to them as I have seen them in the alleys—are men who have sacrificed themselves and proudly served this country in the military. Many of the homeless in the city of Detroit are veterans.

Some of the folks on the street I know personally. I grew up with them. They need help. They need substance abuse treatment. They need a place to stay. And in Detroit, because of the housing crisis, because foreclosures forced many people out of their homes, we also have many apartment buildings that are now vacant—vacant, but could be rehabilitated and renovated to provide a home to our veterans who are currently on the street.

This amendment that I offer will add \$5 million to homeless assistance grants to provide our homeless veterans with a home, but also with the hope and dignity that all Americans deserve.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I would just tell the gentleman that we accept your amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CLARKE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 134, line 11, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The text of that portion of the bill is as follows:

HOUSING PROGRAMS

PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For activities and assistance for the provision of project-based subsidy contracts under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) ("the Act"), not otherwise provided for, \$8,300,400,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2012 (in addition to the \$400,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available October 1, 2012), and \$400,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2013: *Provided*, That the amounts made available under this heading shall be available for expiring or terminating section 8

project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for amendments to section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for contracts entered into pursuant to section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11401), for renewal of section 8 contracts for units in projects that are subject to approved plans of action under the Emergency Low Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987 or the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990, and for administrative and other expenses associated with project-based activities and assistance funded under this paragraph: *Provided further*, That of the total amounts provided under this heading, not to exceed \$260,000,000 shall be available for performance-based contract administrators for section 8 project-based assistance: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may also use such amounts in the previous proviso for performance-based contract administrators for the administration of: interest reduction payments pursuant to section 236(a) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(a)); rent supplement payments pursuant to section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s); section 236(f)(2) rental assistance payments (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(f)(2)); project rental assistance contracts for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q(c)(2)); project rental assistance contracts for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013(d)(2)); project assistance contracts pursuant to section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86-372; 73 Stat. 667); and loans under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86-372; 73 Stat. 667): *Provided further*, That amounts recaptured under this heading, the heading "Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing", or the heading "Housing Certificate Fund" may be used for renewals of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts or for performance-based contract administrators, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 8 project-based Housing Assistance Payments contract that authorizes HUD to require that surplus project funds be deposited in an interest-bearing residual receipts account and that are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary, shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until expended: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available in addition to the amount otherwise provided by this heading for uses authorized under this heading.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

For capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, and for project rental assistance for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of such Act, including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, and for senior preservation rental assistance contracts, as authorized by section 811(e) of the American Housing and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000, as amended, and for supportive services associated with the housing, \$425,000,000 to remain available until Sep-

tember 30, 2016: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, up to \$90,000,000 shall be for service coordinators and the continuation of existing congregate service grants for residents of assisted housing projects: *Provided further*, That amounts under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 202 projects: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive the provisions of section 202 governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance, except that the initial contract term for such assistance shall not exceed 5 years in duration: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, in this fiscal year and hereafter, upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 202 Project Rental Assistance Contract that requires surplus project funds to be deposited in an interest-bearing residual receipts account and be remitted to the Secretary upon termination of the contract, shall be remitted to the Secretary and deposited in this account upon termination of such contract, to be available until expended for capital advances and other eligible assistance for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited in this account pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available in addition to the amounts otherwise provided by this heading for uses authorized under this heading.

HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

For amendments to capital advance contracts for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), for project rental assistance for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of such Act and for project assistance contracts pursuant to section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86-372; 73 Stat. 667), including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, for project rental assistance to State housing finance agencies and other appropriate entities as authorized under section 811(b)(3) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Housing Act, and for supportive services associated with the housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811(b)(1) of such Act, \$165,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 811 Projects.

HOUSING COUNSELING ASSISTANCE

For contracts, grants, and other assistance excluding loans, as authorized under section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended, \$45,000,000, including up to \$2,500,000 for administrative contract services: *Provided*, That grants made available from amounts provided under this heading shall be awarded within 120 days of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That funds shall be used for providing counseling and advice to tenants and homeowners, both current and prospective, with respect to property maintenance, financial management/literacy, and such other matters as may be appropriate to assist them in improving their housing conditions, meeting their financial needs, and fulfilling the responsibilities of tenancy or homeownership; for program administration; and for housing counselor training.

OTHER ASSISTED HOUSING PROGRAMS

PAYMENT TO MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEES TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses as authorized by the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5401 et seq.), up to \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended, which is to be derived from the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed the total amount appropriated under this heading shall be available from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund pursuant to section 620 of such Act: *Provided further*, That the amount made available under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced as such collections are received during fiscal year 2013 so as to result in no fiscal year 2013 appropriation from the general fund estimated and fees pursuant to such section 620 shall be modified as necessary to ensure such a final fiscal year 2013 appropriation: *Provided further*, That for the dispute resolution and installation programs, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may assess and collect fees from any program participant: *Provided further*, That such collections shall be deposited into the Fund, and the Secretary, as provided herein, may use such collections, as well as fees collected under section 620, for necessary expenses of such Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the requirements of section 620 of such Act, the Secretary may carry out responsibilities of the Secretary under such Act through the use of approved service providers that are paid directly by the recipients of their services.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

New commitments to guarantee single family loans insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund shall not exceed \$400,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2013, obligations to make direct loans to carry out the purposes of section 204(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed \$50,000,000: *Provided further*, That the foregoing amount in the previous proviso shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with sales of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund. For administrative contract expenses of the Federal Housing Administration, \$215,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which up to \$71,500,000 may be transferred to and merged with the Working Capital Fund: *Provided further*, That to the extent guaranteed loan commitments exceed \$200,000,000,000 on or before April 1, 2012, an additional \$1,400 for administrative contract expenses shall be available for each \$1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments (including a pro rata amount for any amount below \$1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed \$30,000,000.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to guarantee loans insured under the General and Special Risk Insurance Funds, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-3 and 1735c), shall not exceed \$25,000,000,000 in total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2013, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by sections 204(g), 207(1), 238, and 519(a) of the National Housing Act,

shall not exceed \$20,000,000, which shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with the sale of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)), shall not exceed \$500,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That \$20,500,000 shall be available for necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Government National Mortgage Association: *Provided further*, That to the extent that guaranteed loan commitments will and do exceed \$155,000,000,000 on or before April 1, 2013, an additional \$100 for necessary salaries and expenses shall be available until expended for each \$1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments (including a pro rata amount for any amount below \$1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed \$3,000,000: *Provided further*, That receipts from Commitment and Multiclass fees collected pursuant to title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (12 U.S.C. 1701z-1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under section 1(a)(1)(I) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, \$52,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That with respect to amounts made available under this heading, notwithstanding section 204 of this title, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements funded with philanthropic entities, other Federal agencies, or State or local governments and their agencies for research projects: *Provided further*, That with respect to the previous proviso, such partners to the cooperative agreements must contribute at least a 50 percent match toward the cost of the project: *Provided further*, That for non-competitive agreements entered into in accordance with the previous two provisos, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall comply with section 2(b) of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-282, 31 U.S.C. note) in lieu of compliance with section 102(a)(4)(C) with respect to documentation of award decisions.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended, \$68,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which \$42,500,000 shall be to carry out activities pursuant to such section 561: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Secretary may assess and collect fees to cover the costs of the Fair Housing Training Academy, and may use such funds to provide such training: *Provided further*, That no funds made available under this heading shall be used to lobby the executive or legislative branches

of the Federal Government in connection with a specific contract, grant or loan: *Provided further*, That, of the funds made available under this heading, \$300,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for the creation and promotion of translated materials and other programs that support the assistance of persons with limited English proficiency in utilizing the services provided by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL AND HEALTHY HOMES

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

For the Lead Hazard Reduction Program, as authorized by section 1011 of the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, \$120,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That up to \$10,000,000 of that amount shall be for the Healthy Homes Initiative, pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 that shall include research, studies, testing, and demonstration efforts, including education and outreach concerning lead-based paint poisoning and other housing-related diseases and hazards: *Provided further*, That for purposes of environmental review, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other provisions of the law that further the purposes of such Act, a grant under the Healthy Homes Initiative, Operation Lead Elimination Action Plan (LEAP), or the Lead Technical Studies program under this heading or under prior appropriations Acts for such purposes under this heading, shall be considered to be funds for a special project for purposes of section 305(c) of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$45,000,000 shall be made available on a competitive basis for areas with the highest lead paint abatement needs: *Provided further*, That each recipient of funds provided under the third proviso shall make a matching contribution in an amount not less than 25 percent: *Provided further*, That each applicant shall certify adequate capacity that is acceptable to the Secretary to carry out the proposed use of funds pursuant to a notice of funding availability: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading in this or prior appropriations Acts, and that still remain available, may be used for any purpose under this heading notwithstanding the purpose for which such amounts were appropriated if a program competition is undersubscribed and there are other program competitions under this heading that are oversubscribed.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For additional capital for the Working Capital Fund (42 U.S.C. 3535) for the development of, modifications to, and infrastructure for Department-wide and program-specific information technology systems, for the continuing operation and maintenance of both Department-wide and program-specific information systems, and for program-related maintenance activities, \$175,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund under this Act shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund from amounts appropriated by previously enacted appropriations Acts may be used for the purposes specified under this Fund, in addition to any other information technology the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That not more than 25 percent of the funds made available under this heading for Development, Modernization

and Enhancement, including development and deployment of a Next Generation of Voucher Management System and development and deployment of modernized Federal Housing Administration systems may be obligated until the Secretary submits to the Committees on Appropriations a plan for expenditure that—(A) identifies for each modernization project: (i) the functional and performance capabilities to be delivered and the mission benefits to be realized, (ii) the estimated life-cycle cost, and (iii) key milestones to be met; (B) demonstrates that each modernization project is: (i) compliant with the department's enterprise architecture, (ii) being managed in accordance with applicable life-cycle management policies and guidance, (iii) subject to the department's capital planning and investment control requirements, and (iv) supported by an adequately staffed project office; and (C) has been reviewed by the Government Accountability Office.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$125,600,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have independent authority over all personnel issues within this office.

TRANSFORMATION INITIATIVE

For necessary expenses of research, evaluation, and program metrics activities; program demonstrations; and technical assistance and capacity building, \$50,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That with respect to amounts made available under this heading for research, evaluation and program metrics or program demonstrations, notwithstanding section 204 of this title, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements funded with philanthropic entities, other Federal agencies, or State or local governments and their agencies for research projects: *Provided further*, That with respect to the previous proviso, such partners to the cooperative agreements must contribute at least a 50 percent match toward the cost of the project.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 201. Fifty percent of the amounts of budget authority, or in lieu thereof 50 percent of the cash amounts associated with such budget authority, that are recaptured from projects described in section 1012(a) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1437 note) shall be rescinded or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury, and such amounts of budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury shall be used by State housing finance agencies or local governments or local housing agencies with projects approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for which settlement occurred after January 1, 1992, in accordance with such section. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Secretary may award up to 15 percent of the budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury to provide project owners with incentives to refinance their project at a lower interest rate.

SEC. 202. None of the amounts made available under this Act may be used during fiscal year 2013 to investigate or prosecute under the Fair Housing Act any otherwise lawful activity engaged in by one or more persons, including the filing or maintaining of a non-frivolous legal action, that is engaged in solely for the purpose of achieving or preventing action by a Government official or entity, or a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 203. Sections 203 and 209 of division C of Public Law 112-55 (125 Stat. 693-694) shall apply during fiscal year 2013 as if such sections were included in this title, except that during such fiscal year such sections shall be applied by substituting “fiscal year 2013” for “fiscal year 2011” and “fiscal year 2012”, each place such terms appear.

SEC. 204. Except as explicitly provided in law, any grant, cooperative agreement or other assistance made pursuant to title II of this Act shall be made on a competitive basis and in accordance with section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 3545).

SEC. 205. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811-1).

SEC. 206. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or through a reprogramming of funds, no part of any appropriation for the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be available for any program, project or activity in excess of amounts set forth in the budget estimates submitted to Congress.

SEC. 207. Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of such Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 2013 for such corporation or agency except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

SEC. 208. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall provide quarterly reports to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations regarding all uncommitted, unobligated, recaptured and excess funds in each program and activity within the jurisdiction of the Department and shall submit additional, updated budget information to these Committees upon request.

SEC. 209. The President's formal budget request for fiscal year 2014, as well as the Department of Housing and Urban Development's congressional budget justifications to be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall use the identical account and sub-account structure provided under this Act.

SEC. 210. A public housing agency or such other entity that administers Federal housing assistance for the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California, the

States of Alaska, Iowa, and Mississippi shall not be required to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of assistance provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 on the board of directors or a similar governing board of such agency or entity as required under section (2)(b) of such Act. Each public housing agency or other entity that administers Federal housing assistance under section 8 for the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California and the States of Alaska, Iowa and Mississippi that chooses not to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of section 8 assistance on the board of directors or a similar governing board shall establish an advisory board of not less than six residents of public housing or recipients of section 8 assistance to provide advice and comment to the public housing agency or other administering entity on issues related to public housing and section 8. Such advisory board shall meet not less than quarterly.

SEC. 211. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to the conditions listed in subsection (b), for fiscal years 2013 and 2014, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may authorize the transfer of some or all project-based assistance, debt and statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions, associated with one or more multifamily housing project to another multifamily housing project or projects.

(b) PHASED TRANSFERS.—Transfers of project-based assistance under this section may be done in phases to accommodate the financing and other requirements related to rehabilitating or constructing the project or projects to which the assistance is transferred, to ensure that such project or projects meet the standards under section (c).

(c) The transfer authorized in subsection (a) is subject to the following conditions:

(1) NUMBER AND BEDROOM SIZE OF UNITS.—

(A) For occupied units in the transferring project: the number of low-income and very low-income units and the configuration (i.e. bedroom size) provided by the transferring project shall be no less than when transferred to the receiving project or projects and the net dollar amount of Federal assistance provided by the transferring project shall remain the same in the receiving project or projects.

(B) For unoccupied units in the transferring project: the Secretary may authorize a reduction in the number of dwelling units in the receiving project or projects to allow for a reconfiguration of bedroom sizes to meet current market demands, as determined by the Secretary and provided there is no increase in the project-based section 8 budget authority.

(2) The net dollar amount of Federal assistance provided to the transferring project shall remain the same as the receiving project or projects.

(3) The transferring project shall, as determined by the Secretary, be either physically obsolete or economically nonviable.

(4) The receiving project or projects shall meet or exceed applicable physical standards established by the Secretary.

(5) The owner or mortgagor of the transferring project shall notify and consult with the tenants residing in the transferring project and provide a certification of approval by all appropriate local governmental officials.

(6) The tenants of the transferring project who remain eligible for assistance to be provided by the receiving project or projects shall not be required to vacate their units in the transferring project or projects until new units in the receiving project are available for occupancy.

(7) The Secretary determines that this transfer is in the best interest of the tenants.

(8) If either the transferring project or the receiving project or projects meets the condition specified in subsection (d)(2)(A), any lien on the receiving project resulting from additional financing obtained by the owner shall be subordinate to any FHA-insured mortgage lien transferred to, or placed on, such project by the Secretary, except that the Secretary may waive this requirement upon determination that such a waiver is necessary to facilitate the financing of acquisition, construction, and/or rehabilitation of the receiving project or projects.

(9) If the transferring project meets the requirements of subsection (d)(2)(E), the owner or mortgagor of the receiving project or projects shall execute and record either a continuation of the existing use agreement or a new use agreement for the project where, in either case, any use restrictions in such agreement are of no lesser duration than the existing use restrictions.

(10) The transfer does not increase the cost (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended) of any FHA-insured mortgage, except to the extent that appropriations are provided in advance for the amount of any such increased cost.

(d) For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms “low-income” and “very low-income” shall have the meanings provided by the statute and/or regulations governing the program under which the project is insured or assisted;

(2) the term “multifamily housing project” means housing that meets one of the following conditions—

(A) housing that is subject to a mortgage insured under the National Housing Act;

(B) housing that has project-based assistance attached to the structure including projects undergoing mark to market debt restructuring under the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Housing Act;

(C) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 as amended by section 801 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(D) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as such section existed before the enactment of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(E) housing that is assisted under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act; or

(F) housing or vacant land that is subject to a use agreement;

(3) the term “project-based assistance” means—

(A) assistance provided under section 8(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937;

(B) assistance for housing constructed or substantially rehabilitated pursuant to assistance provided under section 8(b)(2) of such Act (as such section existed immediately before October 1, 1983);

(C) rent supplement payments under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965;

(D) interest reduction payments under section 236 and/or additional assistance payments under section 236(f)(2) of the National Housing Act;

(E) assistance payments made under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959; and

(F) assistance payments made under section 811(d)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959;

(4) the term “receiving project or projects” means the multifamily housing project or projects to which some or all of the project-based assistance, debt, and statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions are to be transferred;

(5) the term “transferring project” means the multifamily housing project which is transferring some or all of the project-based

assistance, debt and the statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions to the receiving project or projects; and

(6) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(e) The Secretary shall publish by notice in the Federal Register the terms and conditions, including criteria for HUD approval, of transfers pursuant to this section no later than 30 days before the effective date of such notice.

SEC. 212. No funds provided under this title may be used for an audit of the Government National Mortgage Association that makes applicable requirements under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.).

SEC. 213. (a) No assistance shall be provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) to any individual who—

(1) is enrolled as a student at an institution of higher education (as defined under section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002));

(2) is under 24 years of age;

(3) is not a veteran;

(4) is unmarried;

(5) does not have a dependent child;

(6) is not a person with disabilities, as such term is defined in section 3(b)(3)(E) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(3)(E)) and was not receiving assistance under such section 8 as of November 30, 2005; and

(7) is not otherwise individually eligible, or has parents who, individually or jointly, are not eligible, to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

(b) For purposes of determining the eligibility of a person to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), any financial assistance (in excess of amounts received for tuition and any other required fees and charges) that an individual receives under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), from private sources, or an institution of higher education (as defined under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)), shall be considered income to that individual, except for a person over the age of 23 with dependent children.

SEC. 214. The funds made available for Native Alaskans under the heading “Native American Housing Block Grants” in title III of this Act shall be allocated to the same Native Alaskan housing block grant recipients that received funds in fiscal year 2005.

SEC. 215. Notwithstanding the limitation in the first sentence of section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-g), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may, until September 30, 2013, insure and enter into commitments to insure mortgages under section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-20).

SEC. 216. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in fiscal year 2013, in managing and disposing of any multifamily property that is owned or has a mortgage held by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and during the process of foreclosure on any property with a contract for rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 or other Federal programs, the Secretary shall maintain any rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 and other programs that are attached to any dwelling units in the property. To the extent the Secretary determines, in consultation with the tenants and the local government, that such a multifamily property owned or held by the Secretary is not feasible for continued rental assistance pay-

ments under such section 8 or other programs, based on consideration of (1) the costs of rehabilitating and operating the property and all available Federal, State, and local resources, including rent adjustments under section 524 of the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 (“MAHRAA”) and (2) environmental conditions that cannot be remedied in a cost-effective fashion, the Secretary may, in consultation with the tenants of that property, contract for project-based rental assistance payments with an owner or owners of other existing housing properties, or provide other rental assistance. The Secretary shall also take appropriate steps to ensure that project-based contracts remain in effect prior to foreclosure, subject to the exercise of contractual abatement remedies to assist relocation of tenants for imminent major threats to health and safety after written notice to and informed consent of the affected tenants and use of other available remedies, such as partial abatements or receivership. After disposition of any multifamily property described under this section, the contract and allowable rent levels on such properties shall be subject to the requirements under section 524 of MAHRAA.

SEC. 217. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall report quarterly to the House of Representatives and Senate Committees on Appropriations on HUD’s use of all sole-source contracts, including terms of the contracts, cost, and a substantive rationale for using a sole-source contract.

SEC. 218. During fiscal year 2013, in the provision of rental assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) in connection with a program to demonstrate the economy and effectiveness of providing such assistance for use in assisted living facilities that is carried out in the counties of the State of Michigan notwithstanding paragraphs (3) and (18)(B)(iii) of such section 8(o), a family residing in an assisted living facility in any such county, on behalf of which a public housing agency provides assistance pursuant to section 8(o)(18) of such Act, may be required, at the time the family initially receives such assistance, to pay rent in an amount exceeding 40 percent of the monthly adjusted income of the family by such a percentage or amount as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 219. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the recipient of a grant under section 202b of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q) after December 26, 2000, in accordance with the unnumbered paragraph at the end of section 202(b) of such Act, may, at its option, establish a single-asset nonprofit entity to own the project and may lend the grant funds to such entity, which may be a private nonprofit organization described in section 831 of the American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000.

SEC. 220. The amounts provided under the subheading “Program Account” under the heading “Community Development Loan Guarantees” may be used to guarantee, or make commitments to guarantee, notes, or other obligations issued by any State on behalf of non-entitlement communities in the State in accordance with the requirements of section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided*, That any State receiving such a guarantee or commitment shall distribute all funds subject to such guarantee to the units of general local government in non-entitlement areas that received the commitment.

SEC. 221. Public housing agencies that own and operate 400 or fewer public housing units may elect to be exempt from any asset management requirement imposed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in

connection with the operating fund rule: *Provided*, That an agency seeking a discontinuance of a reduction of subsidy under the operating fund formula shall not be exempt from asset management requirements.

SEC. 222. With respect to the use of amounts provided in this Act and in future Acts for the operation, capital improvement and management of public housing as authorized by sections 9(d) and 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(d) and (e)), the Secretary shall not impose any requirement or guideline relating to asset management that restricts or limits in any way the use of capital funds for central office costs pursuant to section 9(g)(1) or 9(g)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(g)(1), (2)): *Provided*, That a public housing agency may not use capital funds authorized under section 9(d) for activities that are eligible under section 9(e) for assistance with amounts from the operating fund in excess of the amounts permitted under section 9(g)(1) or 9(g)(2).

SEC. 223. No official or employee of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be designated as an allotment holder unless the Office of the Chief Financial Officer has determined that such allotment holder has implemented an adequate system of funds control and has received training in funds control procedures and directives. The Chief Financial Officer shall ensure that, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a trained allotment holder shall be designated for each HUD subaccount under the heading “Administration, Operations, and Management” as well as each account receiving appropriations for “Program Office Salaries and Expenses” within the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SEC. 224. Payment of attorney fees in program-related litigation must be paid from individual program office personnel benefits and compensation funding. The annual budget submission for program office personnel benefit and compensation funding must include program-related litigation costs for attorney fees as a separate line item request.

SEC. 225. The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall for fiscal year 2013 and subsequent fiscal years, notify the public through the Federal Register and other means, as determined appropriate, of the issuance of a notice of the availability of assistance or notice of funding availability (NOFA) for any program or discretionary fund administered by the Secretary that is to be competitively awarded. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2013 and subsequent fiscal years, the Secretary may make the NOFA available only on the Internet at the appropriate Government Web site or through other electronic media, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 226. The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to transfer up to 5 percent or \$5,000,000, whichever is less, of the funds appropriated for any office funded under the heading “Administration, Operations, and Management” to any other office funded under such heading: *Provided*, That no appropriation for any office funded under the heading “Administration, Operations, and Management” shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent or \$5,000,000, whichever is less, without prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to transfer up to 5 percent or \$5,000,000, whichever is less, of the funds appropriated for any account funded under the general heading “Program Office Salaries and Expenses” to any other account funded under such heading: *Provided further*,

That no appropriation for any account funded under the general heading "Program Office Salaries and Expenses" shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent or \$5,000,000, whichever is less, without prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may transfer funds made available for salaries and expenses between any office funded under the heading "Administration, Operations, and Management" and any account funded under the general heading "Program Office Salaries and Expenses", but only with the prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 227. The Disaster Housing Assistance Programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, shall be considered a "program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development" under section 904 of the McKinney Act for the purpose of income verifications and matching.

SEC. 228. None of the funds made available by this Act, or any other Act, for purposes authorized under section 8 (only with respect to the tenant-based rental assistance program) and section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) may be used by any public housing agency for any amount of salary, for the chief executive officer of which, or any other official or employee of which, that exceeds the annual rate of basic pay payable for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule at any time during any public housing agency fiscal year 2013.

SEC. 229. Paragraph (1) of section 242(i) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-7(i)(1)) is amended by striking "July 31, 2011" and inserting "July 31, 2016".

SEC. 230. Subsection (d) of section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) **GUARANTEE FEE.**—The Secretary shall establish and collect, at the time of issuance of the guarantee, a fee for the guarantee of loans under this section, in an amount not exceeding 3 percent of the principal obligation of the loan. The Secretary may also establish and collect annual premium payments in an amount not exceeding 1 percent of the remaining guaranteed balance (excluding the portion of the remaining balance attributable to the fee collected at the time of issuance of the guarantee). The Secretary shall establish the amount of the fees and premiums by publishing a notice in the Federal Register. The Secretary shall deposit any fees and premiums collected under this subsection in the Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund established under subsection (i)."

SEC. 231. (a) Subsection (b) of section 225 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12755) is amended by inserting at the end the following sentence: "Such 30 day waiting period is not required if the grounds for the termination or refusal to renew involve a direct threat to the safety of the tenants or employees of the housing, or an imminent and serious threat to the property (and the termination or refusal to renew is in accordance with the requirements of State or local law)."

(b) Section 231 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12771) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by striking "make such funds available by direct reallocation" and all that follows through "were recapitulated" and inserting "reallocate the funds by formula in accordance with section 217(d) of this Act (42 U.S.C. 12747(d))"; and

(2) by striking subsection (c).

SEC. 232. Notwithstanding Section 24(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42

U.S.C. 1437v(o)), amounts made available in prior appropriations Acts under the heading "Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing (HOPE VI)" or under the heading "Choice Neighborhoods Initiative" may continue to be provided as assistance pursuant to such Section 24.

SEC. 233. The proviso under the "Community Development Fund" heading in Public Laws 109-148, 109-234, 110-252, and 110-329 which requires the Secretary to establish procedures to prevent duplication of benefits and to report to the Committees on Appropriations on all steps to prevent fraud and abuse is amended by striking "quarterly" and inserting "annually".

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to that portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 234. Title II of division K of Public Law 110-161 is amended by striking the item related to "Flexible Subsidy Fund".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATOURETTE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 134, after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 235. Notwithstanding the 13th proviso of the second undesignated paragraph under the heading "Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund" in title XII of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5; 123 Stat. 218) and section 1497(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111-203; 124 Stat. 2209), a State or unit of general local government in a State may use not more than 75 percent of any amounts made available from a grant under such second undesignated paragraph or under such section 1497 for the purpose set forth in section 2301(c)(4)(D) of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 5301 note), at the sole discretion of the State or unit of general local government.

Mr. LATOURETTE (during the reading.) I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman for reserving the point of order. I think when I'm done consuming my 5 minutes, he will perhaps relent and think that that's a bad idea.

The Neighborhood Stabilization Fund has been a valuable tool all across America in helping to revitalize neighborhoods. I would suggest it has one fatal flaw. There are some homes in every community in America, whether it's Detroit, Los Angeles, Cleveland, where I'm from, where some homes just aren't coming back, and you can't revitalize the neighborhoods until you tear those houses down and start afresh.

One of the difficulties with the Neighborhood Stabilization Fund is it

restricts the ability for a local community to use those funds to demolish homes. I will tell you from touring a number of these properties in my good friend MARCIA FUDGE's district on the east side of Cleveland, these are firetraps, these are ratttraps. The last two Cleveland police officers who have been injured in the line of duty have been injured as they entered a dilapidated home. We toured one home in fact where the expression "everything but the kitchen sink" didn't apply because people had actually taken the kitchen sink, the toilet, the wiring, the gutters, and all of the copper.

Cities are stepping up all across the country to take care of this problem. In the State of Ohio, our Attorney General has devoted \$75 million from the settlement with the top five big banks to this purpose. Mayor Jackson in Cleveland has expended a considerable amount of money. And Ms. FUDGE and I have introduced legislation that would authorize bonds through the Department of Treasury to supplement the great work that land banks all across this country are doing.

But because that bill languishes in the Ways and Means Committee, this simple amendment would give increased flexibility to communities that want to take grants that they've received from the Federal Government to stabilize their neighborhoods to give them the opportunity to use them for demolition if they reach the conclusion that in order to protect the neighbors in that neighborhood who are paying their taxes or keeping up their house, who are paying their mortgage but whose property values continue to plummet because they have this eyesore next door, that if the mayor of Cleveland or the mayor of Toledo or the mayor of Los Angeles reaches the conclusion that it's better in that instance to rip that house down and start over and work with the land banks that are popping up all across the country, they do that.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully ask for passage of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order, but I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell the gentleman from Ohio that I have really no problem with the intent of his amendment, that I think he is talking about something that is very real to a lot of folks.

My understanding is that waivers that have been asked for have all been accepted in the past, and the Secretary has said that if there's a waiver needed, that they would be glad to oblige. But having said that, I just want the gentleman to know that the reason why I must insist on the point of order is simply for consistency on the bill. We have struck on point of order every

other authorizing language that has come before the subcommittee or to the floor today. So with that, while I share his concerns that he has stated, I must insist on my point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

“An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.”

The amendment waives existing law.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LATOURETTE. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my great friend from Iowa for those kind words. I know his heart is in the right place, even if his legislative initiatives at this moment are not.

A lot of people don't realize the history of rule XXI. I've had great conversations in the past with the prior Parliamentarians, the last two, Mr. Sullivan and Charlie—I can't remember Charlie's last name. We talked about the notion of equity. We're not only bound by the rules of the House, but just like in courts all across the country, the Chair has the power of equity in his possession.

Rule XXI has its origins in 1844 when John Quincy Adams, the only President of the United States to come back and serve in the House of Representatives, decided that the appropriations process was bogging down and, therefore, we should have rule XXI to prohibit authorizing on appropriations bills. It was designed to keep the appropriators from poaching on the territory of the authorizing committees.

We don't have that here. The chairman of the authorizing committee was just here, Mr. BACHUS. He doesn't have any problem with this. The only person who is raising the point of order and has a problem with this is the distinguished subcommittee chair of the Appropriations Committee. So that's my first argument on equity.

Secondly, because I had some spare time today, I also looked at the precedents of the House, and I would suggest to the Chair that this is a matter of first impression. The last time that this came to the attention of the Parliamentarian was in 2006. And, sadly, there is a big problem with getting the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD online, but we did get the previous one, which was in 1995 when the gentlelady from Missouri at the time, Ms. Danner, whom many of us remember, was attempting to make a provision in order on the Transportation, it wasn't Transportation-HUD at that time, it was the

Transportation appropriations bill. And in construing the context of clause 2, rule XXI, the Chair at that time indicated that what she was attempting to do is—we have out of the highway trust fund, 2.8 cents goes to transit. That yields a certain amount of money, and she was attempting to wall off \$26 million to go specifically to additional transit projects. The Chair in that instance specifically, and I think correctly, found that you cannot mandate or limit the discretion of the Secretary or another Federal official, nor can you mandate that money be used in a certain way that's not contemplated by the law. As a matter of fact, in section 1057 of the House manual that we all revere here very much, it cites the indications where this has been considered before.

The common theme with all of them is that the person offering the amendment or the Appropriations Committee attempting to implement the policy was attempting to mandate action on the part of a Federal official or mandate that money be spent in a certain way.

I brought up the June 9, 2006, ruling by the Chair, which occurs on page 10673, for those who may be following this at home, and in that instance the offending language was that the statement could not say that not less than a certain sum would be expended on that particular purpose.

This amendment was very carefully crafted. As the Chair, I know being a student of the law and parliamentary procedure, will note that we don't have the words “not less than,” it's “not more than.” Already the existing legislation, the Dodd-Frank Act, contemplates that States who receive—so there's no change in the Federal appropriation. If the city of Cleveland gets a \$100,000 neighborhood stabilization fund, they get to spend it. It doesn't change. There's no Federal involvement after that. It's then up to Mayor Jackson to figure out how to expend it.

This expands the contemplated purpose of that that says a portion is already permitted to be used for demolition. This just says “not more than.” It's not a limitation. It just is increased flexibility for the communities that have received these grants. And honest to gosh, you know, with all of the problems that we have around this place, to go back and violate the spirit of John Quincy Adams' understanding of why we needed rule XXI, to prevent State and local communities from having the flexibility to demolish homes where fires are occurring, where people are selling drugs, where people are being murdered, is really beyond me.

So I appeal to the Chair not only based upon the precedents of the House, but upon the inherent authority of the Chair to exercise equity and understand that there might be a “t” not crossed or an “i” not dotted in this particular instance, but the equitable arguments are on the side of this amendment, and I respectfully ask the Chair to overrule the point of order.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak to the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized.

Ms. KAPTUR. Normally I enjoy working on a bipartisan basis, especially with our good colleague from eastern Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and so in a way I reluctantly rise in opposition to his proposal.

Let me mention that in a way we're into quite a 200-year extensive history of the rules of the House, but in essence the legislation as enacted works. Every single community that I represent that has ever asked HUD for any type of waiver, if the percentage was operating in there to their detriment, it has been granted. And so I think the legislation as is works. It keeps the focus on reinvestment. But if a mayor or if a council wants to use more of their funds for demolition, they merely ask HUD. And, quite frankly, HUD acts in quite an expeditious manner. So I think in a way this is a solution in search of a problem.

I think the gentleman, we welcome his concern about the neighborhoods of this country that have been devastated by the Wall Street-induced housing crisis and lack of regulation here in Washington, but I really don't think it is necessary, and I would support the subcommittee chair and ranking member in their concern by raising a point of order here.

I've expressed my interest in working with the gentleman on any community that you may represent that's facing this situation because every single one that we've had come to us, we have resolved with HUD's full cooperation. So I would support the subcommittee chair's invoking of a point of order on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment explicitly supersedes existing law, namely, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 134, after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 235. Notwithstanding any other provision of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f et seq.), any amounts made available under this title under the heading “Public Housing Operating Fund” and allocated to a public housing agency for activities under section 9(e)(1) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)(1)), and any public housing operating reserve amounts for a public housing agency, may be used by such agency for any eligible activities under section 9(d)(1), in addition to the other purposes for which the amounts

may be used under such heading: *Provided*, That an activity funded pursuant to this section shall be subject to the requirements otherwise governing activities under such section 9(d)(1).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that is of great importance to some of the strongest and best-managed housing authorities in our country.

Currently, housing authorities in our districts receive Federal funds through two distinct streams. One funds day-to-day operations, and the other provides capital funds for construction projects and important modernizations to our Nation's housing stock. Both streams are currently underfunded, not only in this bill but also in the fiscal 2013 administration request.

□ 1510

Now, I believe it's prudent to maintain these two distinct funding streams, but some of our housing authorities do need additional flexibility in tough funding years. Currently, some well-performing housing authorities, like the Raleigh Housing Authority in my district, have created efficiencies in their operating budget and pinched pennies in every way imaginable.

Unfortunately, in order to reallocate these operations savings to urgent capital needs, they have to go through a very cumbersome and cost-ineffective program, that is, HUD's Operating Fund Financing Program. This program requires authorities to go through a financial middleman rather than just letting authorities use their operating funds and savings directly. This process costs unneeded interest payments and it adds unnecessary red tape.

While I hope that our authorizers will be able to improve and streamline this process, I propose that this committee allow housing authorities to use unused operating funds for capital projects directly without having to go through the Operating Fund Financing Program.

My amendment is narrow in scope as it's targeted to 2013 funds and existing reserves only. It's not prospective.

This stopgap solution would provide flexibility for housing authorities, incentivize the wise spending of operating dollars, and help clear up the public housing capital improvement backlog at a time when the construc-

tion industry is still reeling from the recession. This amendment would be a win for Americans who need public housing and a win for Americans who are looking for jobs.

This is not a new endeavor for the Transportation and Housing Appropriations bill; indeed, it's a continuation of the public housing operating fund off-set discussion that we held last year.

However, I understand that there is a point of order. So I will register the hope that the authorizers can conclude their work to address this issue before the end of the year.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

"An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment waives existing law.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? Seeing none, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment explicitly supersedes existing law. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman and Members, I rise in opposition to this underlying bill, the Republican Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill for the coming fiscal year, commonly referred to as THUD. This bill drastically underfunds critical transportation, infrastructure, and housing programs.

First, on transportation, the American Society of Civil Engineers' 2009 report for America's infrastructure estimated that there is a \$549.5 billion shortfall in investments in roads and bridges, and an additional \$190.1 billion shortfall in investments in transit. Yet this bill provides no funds for the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery program, better known as TIGER.

Now, TIGER would finance a wide variety of innovative highway, bridge, and transit projects in urban and rural communities across the country, provided there is sufficient funding. One such project is the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor in Los Angeles County, a light-rail project that will run through my district. TIGER grants

could be used to finance stations along this corridor in the communities of Leimert Park and Westchester, thereby ensuring that these communities have access to light-rail.

Last week, I introduced H.R. 5976, the TIGER Grants for Job Creation Act, which would provide a supplemental emergency appropriation of \$1 billion over the next 2 years for the TIGER program, and 48 of my colleagues have already cosponsored the bill.

Last night, I offered an amendment to fully fund TIGER at the requested level, without cutting funding for other programs. Representatives BETTY MCCOLLUM, BARBARA LEE, EMANUEL CLEAVER, KAREN BASS, LAURA RICHARDSON, BOBBY RUSH, and DORIS MATSUI joined me in offering this amendment. The Republicans objected to this amendment to their appropriations bill because it was not in order under their rule. So this bill has no funding for this critical program to create jobs by rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure.

Why did we have so much support on this legislation? Why do we have so many people who are signing on to basically beg for TIGER funding? It is because TIGER funding will create millions of jobs. It's because jobs are needed so desperately in this economy. It is because not only will we create millions of jobs, our infrastructure is in great disrepair. We have bridges that have been designated as unsafe. We have roads, we have water projects, we have all kinds of infrastructure needs that are unmet. This is the least that the American public could expect.

This transportation bill has been waited on in many communities across this country. People thought when we passed this bill that we truly were going to expand job opportunities, that we truly were going to repair the infrastructure, but we find that this bill does not do this.

But in addition to the disappointment that we are all experiencing because of the objection to repair of the infrastructure and job creation, we find that the same thing is happening in housing. We bemoan the fact that our veterans are homeless and they are on the streets, and that our shelters are all full, and that when we go into many of these communities—not only in our inner cities, but in our rural areas also—we find that people are not only sleeping on the streets, but under these bridges that are in great disrepair.

This legislation cuts money from the homeless program. This will cut \$231 million in homeless assistance grants compared to the President's budget request. At this level, HUD would be unable to fund all renewals of existing grants, jeopardizing assistance to approximately 25,000 of our most vulnerable citizens.

This bill provides less than \$2 billion for the Public Housing Capital Fund, despite a \$30 million backlog of needed repairs. This is a huge cut, even when compared to funding during the Bush administration. In fact, in fiscal year

2008, the capital account received \$2.4 billion in funding. This underfunding means that we will continue to lose public housing units as they fall into disrepair and long-term capital needs are neglected.

The people who are serviced by this account are vulnerable, and so I would simply ask that this be given some real consideration and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, Americans need to know that Tea Party Republican obstructionism has brought us to the brink of yet another manufactured crisis.

We have less than 2 days to pass critical highway and student loan bills that will keep Americans on the job and prevent student loan rates from doubling. Yet Tea Party Republicans are wasting time on frivolous amendments and on a purely meritless, political, and partisan vote to hold the Attorney General in contempt.

Reports indicate that bipartisan Senate leadership has reached a deal on student loans and the highway bill as well, a deal which is now being blocked in the House by the Tea Party Republicans. This is not governing, ladies and gentlemen; it's Tea Party gridlock.

Americans long for a Congress that is capable of honest debate and compromise in solving the important issues of the day. That's what the Founders and the Framers intended of us.

It's been over 100 days since the Senate passed a bipartisan highway bill with 74 votes. While the House Tea Party Republicans quibble, they put 1.9 million jobs at risk.

□ 1520

Mr. Chairman, if the Tea Party Republicans prevent a deal on student loans, over 7.4 million students will see their interest rates double, costing students \$6 billion.

They brought us to the brink of a government shut down in February of 2011. Last summer they brought the country to the brink of default and caused the first downgrade in the history of the United States of our credit rating. This year, they opposed the middle class tax cut, and they have successfully ignored and blocked the President's job act.

Mr. Chairman, we should listen to the American people, not the big-dollar corporate backers of the Tea Party. I, myself, never knew that any of the real Tea Partiers of 1776 were millionaires or even wealthy. They were people like the working people of today. We call them the middle class.

Today, we are debating cut after draconian cut to our Nation's transportation and housing programs, which impact and hurt the middle class. These cuts put good, middle class jobs at risk. They make it harder for small businesses to operate, and they cause

harm to low-income Americans who are struggling to put food on the table and a roof over their heads.

The Tea Party-millionaire Republicans will spend all week circling the toilet bowl drain and debating these amendments that have no chance of becoming law, when we should be lowering student loan rates and passing a long-term highway bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great country, but how long can we withstand the best efforts of this millionaire Tea Party Republican Congress to bring America to its knees?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, it is no secret to anyone in this Chamber that the American people are unhappy with Congress. In fact, our approval ratings could only be described as terrible. As much as television personalities might like to analyze why, I don't think it's difficult to understand. Time and time again, Mr. Chairman, our work ignores their priorities.

Now, under Republican leadership, we have spent months arguing over eliminating regulations, shrinking government, and crippling the Obama administration. Yet since the lowest point of economic downturn in 2008, the American people have cared mostly about two things: good jobs and stable housing. These are issues that have hit the African American community especially hard, which is why I come to the floor today with several of my colleagues from the Congressional Black Caucus.

Today, Mr. Chairman, unemployment among African Americans is above 13 percent, much higher than the national average. Concerns about stable housing are really nothing new, but they have been especially difficult since the start of our recession. In fact, 42 percent of homeless families with children are African American. So we were all glad to see the House take up the Transportation-HUD bill this week. We hoped to see some relief for our struggling communities.

But sadly, this bill falls short. It fails to adequately fund project-based section 8 rental assistance for low-income families. That means over 1.2 million families, Mr. Chairman, would be at risk of losing their homes. These are primarily seniors, families with children, and people with disabilities, including many who are in the great Hoosier State in my district.

The bill cuts homeless assistance grants, leaving an estimated 25,000 people without the assistance they need to get back on their feet. It entirely eliminates the Choice Neighborhoods program. In Indianapolis, we need these funds to rebuild blighted public housing projects, improve economic development and job opportunities in surrounding neighborhoods for low-income families.

It also eliminates the Sustainable Communities, which coordinates Federal, State and local public housing investments, helping communities make the best with limited funding.

I also want to add that I plan to strongly oppose any amendment that makes it harder to enforce the Fair Housing Act. Congress should not restrict HUD's work to end housing discrimination, intentional or unintentional.

These cuts, Mr. Chairman, strike at the very heart of what my constituents care about, having a stable place for their families to live and stay.

Over the last several months, Mr. Chairman, there has been one topic we have all agreed on, transportation projects equal jobs. Now, sadly, this bill defunds some of our most important job-creating programs. It eliminates funding for TIGER grants, which have put thousands of people to work across this country. My district received one of these grants to construct our great cultural trail. Many of my constituents worked to construct this trail, and today it is absolutely revitalizing neighborhoods and growing businesses and creating long-term job opportunities.

This bill also eliminates funding for high-speed rail, which early estimates predict could have created thousands of jobs in the great Hoosier State. Now, of course, there are other issues; but there are too many to name at this time.

But in talking today, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to express my disappointment. This week we are finally considering the one bill each year that must address top priorities for all Americans, jobs and housing. Instead, we're cutting programs.

My question to these people is, Mr. Chairman, and those obstructionists, what are you expecting our communities to do?

These are programs that work. They employ our constituents, Mr. Chairman, and they also improve our society.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, here we are once again. We find ourselves debating a bill that is under veto threat due to the Republicans my-way-or-the-highway posture.

Mr. Chairman, last month saw the largest drop in construction jobs in 2 years, workers who joined the more than 2.2 million construction workers who are out of work.

However, instead of providing certainty to our Nation's construction workers by investing in the TIGER program and light-speed rail, the Republican majority has actually zeroed these programs out completely. Apparently, the majority seems to only believe in certainty when it means historically low tax rates for multi-millionaires and billionaires.

Mr. Chairman, the majority's lack of investment in our Nation's infrastructure is bad enough. Unfortunately, it gets even worse. At a time when the need for HUD programs is growing, this bill drastically undercuts homeless assistance grants, putting 25,000 Americans at risk of losing assistance. It jeopardizes assistance to homeowners attempting to stay in their homes and actually zeroes out the Choice Neighborhoods program. Why?

Mr. Chairman, why we would essentially eliminate a program that improves economic development and viability and job opportunities for our Nation's most vulnerable is beyond my ability to comprehend.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have made it abundantly clear that the number one priority of the 112th Congress ought to be job creation.

□ 1530

By bringing this bill to the floor, the majority is saying to the American people, not only doesn't their unemployed status or opinions matter, but don't expect any relief from this Republican-led Congress as our Nation struggles to cope with the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression.

Mr. Chairman, this is just totally unbelievable. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This title may be cited as the "Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 2013".

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

ACCESS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Access Board, as authorized by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, \$7,400,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation funds received for publications and training expenses.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission as authorized by section 201(d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 307), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b); and uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902, \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 135, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$900,000)".

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$900,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce the

proposed funding for salaries and expenses for the Federal Maritime Commission by \$900,000. This is not a cut. This is just to keep those salaries at what they are, to cap it at the 2012 levels. This is one of 13 offices that would receive increases for salaries or administrative expenses in the underlying bill.

I urge the support of my amendment, which would just freeze these salaries.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Maritime Commission is responsible for resolving disputes between shippers—both foreign and domestic—and the public, protecting consumers from unfair business practices, and monitoring ocean transportation and trade.

The increase in this account has to do with the annualization of already onboard personnel and of the increases in the claims and the workload of the Federal Maritime Commission. To reduce this account, you will affect the backlog of cases and claims, thus costing businesses, exporters, and ports time and money while they wait for the FMC to adjudicate their claims.

Usually, we are in the business of trying to reduce backlogs and delays in doing business. With that, I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLIVER. I will be very brief.

I merely want to concur in the position of the chairman of the subcommittee, and I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have all necessary authority, in carrying out the duties specified in the Inspector General Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 3), to investigate allegations of fraud, including false statements to

the government (18 U.S.C. 1001), by any person or entity that is subject to regulation by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General may enter into contracts and other arrangements for audits, studies, analyses, and other services with public agencies and with private persons, subject to the applicable laws and regulations that govern the obtaining of such services within the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General may select, appoint, and employ such officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Office of Inspector General, subject to the applicable laws and regulations that govern such selections, appointments, and employment within Amtrak: *Provided further*, That concurrent with the President's budget request for fiscal year 2014, the Inspector General shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a budget request for fiscal year 2014 in similar format and substance to those submitted by executive agencies of the Federal Government.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Transportation Safety Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for a GS-15; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), \$102,400,000, of which not to exceed \$2,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses. The amounts made available to the National Transportation Safety Board in this Act include amounts necessary to make lease payments on an obligation incurred in fiscal year 2001 for a capital lease.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101-8107), \$145,300,000: *Provided*, That in addition, \$80,000,000 shall be made available until expended to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for mortgage foreclosure mitigation activities, under the following terms and conditions:

(1) The Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation ("NRC") shall make grants to counseling intermediaries approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (with match to be determined by the NRC based on affordability and the economic conditions of an area; a match also may be waived by the NRC based on the aforementioned conditions) to provide mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance primarily to States and areas with high rates of defaults and foreclosures to help eliminate the default and foreclosure of mortgages of owner-occupied single-family homes that are at risk of such foreclosure. Other than areas with high rates of defaults and foreclosures, grants may also be provided to approved counseling intermediaries based on a geographic analysis of the Nation by the NRC which determines where there is a prevalence of mortgages that are risky and likely to fail, including any trends for mortgages that are likely to default and face foreclosure. A State Housing Finance Agency may also be eligible where the State Housing Finance Agency meets all the requirements under this paragraph. A HUD-approved counseling intermediary shall meet certain mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance counseling requirements, as determined by the

NRC, and shall be approved by HUD or the NRC as meeting these requirements.

(2) Mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance shall only be made available to homeowners of owner-occupied homes with mortgages in default or in danger of default. These mortgages shall likely be subject to a foreclosure action and homeowners will be provided such assistance that shall consist of activities that are likely to prevent foreclosures and result in the long-term affordability of the mortgage retained pursuant to such activity or another positive outcome for the homeowner. No funds made available under this paragraph may be provided directly to lenders or homeowners to discharge outstanding mortgage balances or for any other direct debt reduction payments.

(3) The use of Mortgage Foreclosure Mitigation Assistance by approved counseling intermediaries and State Housing Finance Agencies shall involve a reasonable analysis of the borrower's financial situation, an evaluation of the current value of the property that is subject to the mortgage, counseling regarding the assumption of the mortgage by another non-Federal party, counseling regarding the possible purchase of the mortgage by a non-Federal third party, counseling and advice of all likely restructuring and refinancing strategies or the approval of a work-out strategy by all interested parties.

(4) NRC may provide up to 15 percent of the total funds under this paragraph to its own charter members with expertise in foreclosure prevention counseling, subject to a certification by the NRC that the procedures for selection do not consist of any procedures or activities that could be construed as an unacceptable conflict of interest or have the appearance of impropriety.

(5) HUD-approved counseling entities and State Housing Finance Agencies receiving funds under this paragraph shall have demonstrated experience in successfully working with financial institutions as well as borrowers facing default, delinquency and foreclosure as well as documented counseling capacity, outreach capacity, past successful performance and positive outcomes with documented counseling plans (including post mortgage foreclosure mitigation counseling), loan workout agreements and loan modification agreements. NRC may use other criteria to demonstrate capacity in underserved areas.

(6) Of the total amount made available under this paragraph, up to \$3,000,000 may be made available to build the mortgage foreclosure and default mitigation counseling capacity of counseling intermediaries through NRC training courses with HUD-approved counseling intermediaries and their partners, except that private financial institutions that participate in NRC training shall pay market rates for such training.

(7) Of the total amount made available under this paragraph, up to 5 percent may be used for associated administrative expenses for the NRC to carry out activities provided under this section.

(8) Mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance grants may include a budget for outreach and advertising, and training, as determined by the NRC.

(9) The NRC shall continue to report bi-annually to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations as well as the Senate Banking Committee and House Financial Services Committee on its efforts to mitigate mortgage default.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF
GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 137, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,300,000)”.

Page 150, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$12,300,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Funding for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation is over \$12 million higher than what the President's budget request was. Now, the President and I don't typically see eye to eye on most spending issues, but I am proud to support his requested level of funding for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.

By supporting my amendment, why don't we show the American people that we are serious about our Nation's fiscal crisis and that both parties are capable of working together by setting the funding back to the President's requested funding level for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, which would save the American taxpayers over \$12 million.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. This is one of those cases in which we've gone back and forth here today with the gentleman from California. This must be the eighth or ninth of these, and it's hard to find ways of being very creative or original about what you're saying.

The interesting thing here is that, for some of the time, the gentleman has been going back to whatever we had done several years ago, going back arbitrarily to some point in the past. Here, of course, he is supporting the President's position. I was not aware that the gentleman from California supported the President's position in much of anything.

Mr. LATHAM. If the gentleman would yield, the gentleman is from Georgia.

Mr. OLVER. Excuse me. Thank you very much.

Please forgive me. You don't even look alike. I think I was mistaking you for a different member of the California delegation.

I thank the gentleman from Iowa for correcting me.

In any case, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The gentleman's amendment would take the position of this subcommittee down by \$12.3 million. Basically, the position of the subcommittee has been that we are providing a little bit more for the NeighborWorks program than the President requested and that we are providing a little bit less for the HUD Counseling program than the President requested. Together, though, they would be about the same.

NeighborWorks, which is what the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corpora-

tion's common name is, is a major non-profit organization that operates all over the country. It has affiliates in 50 States, and I'm sure it has an affiliate somewhere in the gentleman's district. The NeighborWorks program is a group that we relied on very heavily to do counseling during the very height of the foreclosure crisis 3 or 4 years ago. We relied on it to go out there and actually contract with and manage the process of providing counseling to hundreds of thousands of people who were engaged in or who were subject to foreclosure.

So we on our side, on this side—in this branch at least—have felt that NeighborWorks has been a very good organization, which is in large part why we have given them a little bit more and why we have given a little bit less to the HUD program.

We argued the HUD program last night. They leverage something close to \$4 billion in direct investments to serve low- and moderate-income families through all of their affiliates in all the work that they do. It's a very, very good and reliable organization that we've come to value very highly.

They also administered this Foreclosure Mitigation Counseling program, which gives targeted assistance to families at risk of losing their homes. The gentleman seems to cut this account because it is above the President's request, but I think I have explained that we're slightly above on this one and slightly below on the other one.

Again, I would say I was not aware that the gentleman from Georgia—I went to California again, didn't I?—was such a fan of the President's request numbers, that he valued them so highly. I believe—and I think that my chairman believes—that NeighborWorks is deserving of this small increase, and I believe that Chairman LATHAM has thoughtfully targeted resources in this area. I hope the amendment will be defeated, and I urge the Members to vote “no.”

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1540

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

NeighborWorks really is a program that has some metrics in place to make sure that the dollars are used correctly in a proper way. In Iowa and across the country, about every dollar that goes through NeighborWorks leverages \$48 in non-Federal direct investment because of it.

I just want to reiterate that we've gone through every line in this appropriations bill, tried to make decisions that would increase growth, job creation, tried to do the very best job we could. We've looked at every area. There are some priorities of things

that actually work that we've tried to sustain funding for.

I just don't want folks to forget overall in this bill, we are nearly \$4 billion below last year's funding level. That's a cut of \$4 billion. It's \$2 billion below the President's request. I think, as one gentleman here today stated, this is the largest percentage reduction of any appropriation bill yet to come to the floor. We're trying to be fiscally responsible, to actually prioritize spending in this bill to things that actually work.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in opposition to this amendment and to say to the gentleman from Georgia that I don't really know where you might live in Georgia, but imagine neighborhoods in our country where there is no private lender with competitive rates; imagine neighborhoods that are crammed at the edges with payday lenders who are more than willing to bilk people who have checks to cash, maybe even Social Security checks, and they charge them royally for that; imagine a neighborhood where there is no church-run credit union, maybe a multilingual neighborhood with no lending arm of any reputable institution. If there is somebody in the neighborhood willing to make a loan, such as a loan shark, they charge fees. Imagine the trouble that a family can get into. Imagine how difficult it is in those neighborhoods to accumulate capital to make a loan because everything is being taken out by predatory practices and nothing is put back in.

NeighborWorks is one of the few institutions in this country that has proven itself and works in exactly those kinds of neighborhood. NeighborWorks tries to save families and give them a chance to get on the ladder up to opportunity. Particularly during this time, when we know we've had the largest transfer of wealth in American history from Main Street to Wall Street. NeighborWorks is a lifeline. People have had their equity taken away, including in neighborhoods like I'm talking about, where people were beginning to own their own homes for the first time, where they needed financial counseling, mortgage counseling, advice on if you're going to buy a home, what a reasonable down payment is, based on how much do they earn. People need sound advice on mortgages—that you shouldn't pay more than this out of your check so you don't get in trouble. People need advice as they try to find reputable people to repair their homes so they get a decent price on their roof and gutters—it all seems so simple if you live in the suburbs, and you've got

enough money, and the region is not disinvested, and you're not living at the edge.

NeighborWorks is one of those programs that is needed, particularly at this time in our country with the housing market being in the condition that it is. With the enormous challenges facing built communities in the built environment in city after city, NeighborWorks serves community after community, both urban and rural. It's amazing what's happened even to rural small towns in this country and their emptying out that is really historic in nature.

A program like NeighborWorks has proven itself time and again. It pays back to the American people their equity not being lost, in helping capital accumulate in some of the most forgotten corners of this country, and with their staff that are highly trained and highly reputable.

I would not want to be without NeighborWorks in Ohio, not in the housing situation that we're facing today. I'm not sure about Georgia. But I would bet in Atlanta they value NeighborWorks if they have one, and I assume that they do. But you have to imagine yourself living in a place like you may not know. And for the American Dream to happen, organizations like NeighborWorks are absolutely essential.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment. I think it may be well intentioned, but I think it's going to achieve exactly the wrong result. I think Chairman LATHAM of the full committee and Ranking Member OLVER have reached an accommodation here to help our housing market recover in some of the most forgotten places and not to have any more hemorrhaging of equity and investment capital across this country. I urge a no vote on the Broun Amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROWN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I was on the floor about a half an hour ago and went back to my office stunned by the defeat at the hands of Mr. LATHAM and his point of order and the ruling of the Parliamentarian and the Chair at the time and the interesting comments from my friend from western Ohio, who I trust, after she has the opportunity to meet with Mr.

Rokakis and Mr. KILDEE in Michigan and Cleveland, will have a different view on whether or not the Neighborhood Stabilization fund, without additional resources to demolish homes, is working well.

When I got back to the office, I turned on the television and I saw—I like a good Republican bashing as much as other folks, but a string of speakers came to the microphone and just bashed the lack of a Republican plan on transportation.

I'm not going to go back to 1844, but I am going to go back to September of 2009, the last bill, SAFETEA-LU, expired in September of 2009. In September of 2009—people who know the answer, you can shout it out—the President of the United States was a Democrat, Barack Obama, who is currently the President today. The majority leader in the United States Senate—shout it out if you know it—was HARRY REID, a Democrat of Nevada. The Speaker of the House was the first woman-elected Speaker in the history of the United States, NANCY PELOSI of California.

The Democratic Party controlled all three levers of the Federal Government. They had in position as the chairman of the Transportation Infrastructure Committee a gentleman who has forgotten more about transportation than most of us will ever learn, Jim Oberstar of Minnesota. Mr. Oberstar prepared a 6-year fully funded, robust Federal transportation 6-year reauthorization. He was not allowed by the leadership within the Democratic Party to bring that bill forward.

So for people to come to the floor and say that Mr. LATHAM is not doing his job, this negotiation that is going on on the transportation authorization currently is somehow a failure of Republican leadership, I say get up and look in the mirror. You have to take a look at the fact that everybody is responsible for this mess, and everybody knows that you don't fix the Nation's infrastructure unless you provide the necessary resources to fund the trust fund. Both parties are guilty of being absent without leave, but to blame it and to hang it on the Republican Party is worse than nonsense. It completely ignores historical fact.

One other factoid about the President of the United States, President Obama. He has become the first President since Dwight Eisenhower to not send up his vision of a comprehensive transportation reauthorization bill. A lot of people in this House weren't even born when Dwight Eisenhower was the President of the United States, but he became the first President. And our good friend and former colleague, Mr. LaHood, who is the Secretary of Transportation, he would come before the subcommittee year after year after year and had no ideas, no gas tax, no vehicle miles traveled, no idea how we're going to replenish the highway trust fund until this year. Until this year, he came and said: I've got this

brainy idea. We're going to fund it with OCO, the overseas contingency account, that the United States has used to support our troops in conflicts around the world.

It was worse than fiction; it was a fantasy. And he knew it, but he delivered it with a straight face. I give him a lot of credit for that. But to come to the floor and attempt to hang this around the Republicans for failing to lead on transportation is laughable. Ours is the party of Teddy Roosevelt and the Panama Canal, Abraham Lincoln and the transcontinental railroad, Dwight Eisenhower and the interstate highway system. Ronald Reagan and George Bush all supported working wages to build our infrastructure.

□ 1550

We will not take a back seat, nor will we be criticized by a party that completely failed in its mandate given to them in the election of 2008 to do a single thing, to employ people in the transportation sector and to move this country forward.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON
HOMELESSNESS
OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses (including payment of salaries, authorized travel, hire of passenger motor vehicles, the rental of conference rooms, and the employment of experts and consultants under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code) of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness in carrying out the functions pursuant to title II of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, \$3,300,000.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 401. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2013 pay raises for programs funded in this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act or previous appropriations Acts.

SEC. 402. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

SEC. 403. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 404. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 405. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies or entities funded in this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2013, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury derived by the collection of fees and available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be avail-

able for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that:

- (1) creates a new program;
- (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity;
- (3) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;
- (4) proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either the House or Senate Committees on Appropriations for a different purpose;
- (5) augments existing programs, projects, or activities in excess of \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less;
- (6) reduces existing programs, projects, or activities by \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or
- (7) creates, reorganizes, or restructures a branch, division, office, bureau, board, commission, agency, administration, or department different from the budget justifications submitted to the Committees on Appropriations or the table accompanying the explanatory statement accompanying this Act, whichever is more detailed, unless prior approval is received from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency funded by this Act shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the report shall include:

(A) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(B) a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by object class and program, project, and activity as detailed in the budget appendix for the respective appropriation; and

(C) an identification of items of special congressional interest: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated or limited for salaries and expenses for an agency shall be reduced by \$100,000 per day for each day after the required date that the report has not been submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 406. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2013 from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2013 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2014, for each such account for the purposes authorized: *Provided*, That a request shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: *Provided further*, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines under section 405 of this Act.

SEC. 407. All Federal agencies and departments that are funded under this Act shall issue a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on all sole-source contracts by no later than July 30, 2013. Such report shall include the contractor, the amount of the contract and the rationale for using a sole-source contract.

SEC. 408. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for any employee training that—

- (1) does not meet identified needs for knowledge, skills, and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties;

(2) contains elements likely to induce high levels of emotional response or psychological stress in some participants;

(3) does not require prior employee notification of the content and methods to be used in the training and written end of course evaluation;

(4) contains any methods or content associated with religious or quasi-religious belief systems or "new age" belief systems as defined in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Notice N-915.022, dated September 2, 1988; or

(5) is offensive to, or designed to change, participants' personal values or lifestyle outside the workplace.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict, or otherwise preclude an agency from conducting training bearing directly upon the performance of official duties.

SEC. 409. No funds in this Act may be used to support any Federal, State, or local projects that seek to use the power of eminent domain, unless eminent domain is employed only for a public use: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, public use shall not be construed to include economic development that primarily benefits private entities: *Provided further*, That any use of funds for mass transit, railroad, airport, seaport or highway projects as well as utility projects which benefit or serve the general public (including energy-related, communication-related, water-related and wastewater-related infrastructure), other structures designated for use by the general public or which have other common-carrier or public-utility functions that serve the general public and are subject to regulation and oversight by the government, and projects for the removal of an immediate threat to public health and safety or brownfields as defined in the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act (Public Law 107-118) shall be considered a public use for purposes of eminent domain.

SEC. 410. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 411. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to pay the salary for any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of active military or naval service, and has within 90 days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year, made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Office of Personnel Management as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 412. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

Mr. GARAMENDI. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 148, line 11, after "entity will", insert "ensure that domestic content makes up 85 percent of all steel, iron, and manufactured goods, including rolling stock, and".

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, we just heard a rather strong plea from one of my Republican colleagues about the transportation program and whether Democrats and Republicans should continue to fight about who did what when or didn't do it.

This amendment is something that we all ought to agree to. This amendment is something that both Democrats and Republicans should be supporting. This amendment is about American jobs—not foreign jobs, not about shifting our jobs overseas, but rather about bringing those jobs back home. This amendment is about making it in America. This amendment is about no longer allowing our tax money to be spent on foreign-made equipment but, rather, to require that our tax money be spent on American-made equipment so that there will be American jobs.

This is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. This is an all-American issue. This is about making it in America. It simply says that the current 60 percent requirement is insufficient and that we ought to have a higher requirement of 85 percent. And I will argue strongly—and I think correctly—that 85 percent is achievable.

I'll give two examples: In a recent contract for the new BART trains, the Bay Area Rapid Transit trains, one bidder—a French company, Alstom—said that they could build those trains at 95 percent. A second bidder—foreign, Bombardier—said they would do it at 66 percent. Unfortunately, BART decided to go with the 66 percent because it was a couple of percentage points cheaper. \$1 billion in American jobs were lost.

Within a month after that, Los Angeles wanted to build some new transit cars. Siemens said they could build those transit cars at 85 percent American content. They lost that bid to a Korean company because there was a couple of percentage points difference. Again, millions of American jobs, millions of dollars spent overseas, and American jobs lost.

It's time for us to bring the jobs home. It's time for us to onshore. It's time for us to make it in America. And it's time for us, as Democrats and Republicans, to do just that. And that's what this amendment does.

I suspect it will be ruled out of order. What a shame. What a shame that we cannot stand here on the floor, amend a bill that's going to, over time, spend \$60 billion, and not require that that money, our tax money, be spent in America.

What's wrong with making it in America? Oh, I suppose it has to do with some point of order. Do you think the American public really wants to

hear a point of order? Or do they want to hear about American-made equipment and American jobs? No. We'll do a point of order, which I will appeal and probably lose. And thousands upon thousands of American jobs will be lost because of a point of order rather than for this House to stand up and say, We're going to make it in America. We're going to spend our tax money on American jobs, on American-made equipment.

So give me your point of order, and let's see what the American public has to say about your point of order.

I yield back the balance of my time

Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, we had a markup this morning in Appropriations, and I supported an amendment about American content. And I believe that this is probably a very, very good amendment.

To be consistent—and I have raised points of order against some things that I support today, one offered by my good friend from Ohio, and other amendments that I would otherwise be supportive of if they were not breaking precedent to the rules of the House.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

"An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to speak on the point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. On the point of order, I thank the chairman for his thoughts on the issue. But for his consistency, I cannot thank him. I think I understand that we seem to operate on rules, unless we don't want to operate on those rules.

I understand that the chairman is interested in this issue and has worked, as chairman of the subcommittee, to try to raise the level of American-made, and I thank him for that.

We have an opportunity here to really take this issue up and put aside the rules and do what's good for America. This is about billions and billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of jobs. We ought to put it aside, put aside the consistency and deal with American jobs.

I don't know what my opportunity will be to overrule the point of order. But I'm going to do everything I possibly can to see that we have Amer-

ican-made jobs and that we spend our tax money on American-made equipment.

I do understand the chairman's position and the bind that he's in. But sometimes consistency doesn't lead to the right result.

□ 1600

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

As recorded in Deschler's Precedents, volume 8, chapter 26, section 3, language in an appropriation bill that is subject to a point of order under clause 2 of rule XXI but is permitted to remain, such as by waiver in House Resolution 697, may be modified by germane amendment that does not contain additional legislation.

Section 412 of the bill constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI that has been permitted to remain. The amendment by the gentleman from California would expand section 412 by imposing on entities by the bill an additional restriction on expenditure of funds in the bill, to wit: that 85 percent of a certain class of goods be procured domestically. That expansion constitutes additional legislation.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. I have an amendment that would prohibit funds from being used to enforce congressionally mandated Temporary Flight Restrictions, or TFRs, for sports stadiums. These permanent TFRs, to be quite honest with you, are impractical, they're ineffective, and they create serious problems for hundreds of thousands of pilots, countless air shows, aerial surveyors, and a whole lot of other small businesses and individuals that utilize aviation.

In 2004, Congress mandated the FAA to impose permanent TFRs in the airspace above and around sports stadiums with a seating capacity greater than 30,000. Think of these as restricted airspace bubbles that basically extend 3,000 feet high and they have a 3½ mile-wide radius that is in effect 1 hour prior to the event to 1 hour just after the event. And in any given year, there are roughly 3,000 of these stadium TFRs.

Now, proponents of these claim that they bolster national security and mitigate an aerial threat. I can't help but absolutely laugh at that assertion. First, there's absolutely no realtime mechanism or capability to prevent an aerial attack originating within or outside the 3½ miles at 3,000 feet above ground level, and the logic would apply even if the restrictions were expanded exponentially. In fact, if you take a jet traveling at 500 miles an hour, it's just going to take a few seconds to penetrate that TFR to reach that stadium.

It's also very convenient that the proponents of these TFRs are exempt from the restrictions that they successfully sought after.

The bottom line is the FAA doesn't want or need these congressionally mandated TFRs. In fact, the FAA publicly stated they would not issue these TFRs absent the congressional mandate, but, rather, they would use their existing authority to coordinate with local law enforcement to issue them on a case-by-case basis. That's what we're trying to get at.

Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to reiterate these stadium TFRs do nothing to improve security. And I would yield time to anybody out there, any Member, that would like to try and make the argument while keeping a straight face that they do improve security.

These TFRs are about banner towers, which is to prevent what sports groups call "guerilla advertisers," from operating within the airspace around these stadiums. That's all this is about. And what was Congress's solution? We simply gave complete control of the airspace to sports teams and exempted them from their own restrictions. And I think that's wrong.

In light of the fact that I would like to solve this issue eventually instead of trying to ram an issue through or try to push something through that could fail or be passed, I'd rather come up with a good piece of legislation that actually solves the problem and addresses some of the concerns. That's basically what I was trying to do.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman for his comments today. He has been a tremendous advocate for this position. We have talked on many occasions about this particular subject. He is working very hard to resolve the issue.

I would hope that we could have some public hearings and actually get input to make sure that we make the right decisions, and I certainly would want to work with the gentleman to make sure that we do get a full hearing on this issue, that everything can be brought to light, and we're all concerned about homeland security, safety issues, all those things. I think the gentleman makes a very, very good point, and would just offer to do everything we can to work with him.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. I want to thank the chairman for the comments and look forward to working on this. I think this is an issue that we can solve and an issue that we can fix ultimately for all those pilots out there and the folks that are concerned.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 413. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act shall be made available to any person or entity that

has been convicted of violating the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c).

SEC. 414. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for first-class airline accommodations in contravention of sections 301–10.122 and 301–10.123 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 415. None of the funds made available under this Act or any prior Act may be provided to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, or allied organizations.

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted (or had an officer or agent of such corporation acting on behalf of the corporation convicted) of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation, or such officer or agent, and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 417. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 418. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is \$0.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Sixth amendment by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

Seventh amendment by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

Eighth amendment by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

Ninth amendment by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

Tenth amendment by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

Eleventh amendment by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

Twelfth amendment by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

Thirteenth amendment by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

Fourteenth amendment by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. CHAFFETZ of Utah.

Second amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the sixth amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROWN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 256, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 424]

AYES—168

Adams	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Akin	Griffin (AR)	Paul
Amash	Griffith (VA)	Paulsen
Bachmann	Grimm	Pence
Barrow	Guinta	Petri
Bartlett	Guthrie	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Hall	Poe (TX)
Benish	Hanna	Pompeo
Bliley	Harris	Posey
Bilirakis	Hartzer	Price (GA)
Black	Hensarling	Quayle
Blackburn	Herger	Reichert
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Ribble
Brooks	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Brown (GA)	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Buchanan	Hurt	Rogers (MI)
Bucshon	Issa	Rohrabacher
Buerkle	Jenkins	Rokita
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Rooney
Burton (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Ross (FL)
Canseco	Jones	Royce
Cantor	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	King (IA)	Scalise
Chabot	Kingston	Schilling
Chaffetz	Kline	Schmidt
Coble	Labrador	Schweikert
Conaway	Lamborn	Scott (SC)
Cravaack	Lance	Scott, Austin
Culberson	Landry	Sensenbrenner
Denham	Lankford	Sessions
DesJarlais	Latta	Shuster
Dreier	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Duffy	Long	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Duncan (TN)	Lummis	Southerland
Ellmers	Manzullo	Stearns
Emerson	Marchant	Stutzman
Farenthold	Marino	Sullivan
Fincher	Matheson	Terry
Flake	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Fleischmann	McCauley	Tiberi
Fleming	McClintock	Upton
Flores	McCotter	Walberg
Forbes	McHenry	Walsh (IL)
Fortenberry	McMorris	Webster
Fox	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Whitfield
Gardner	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Wittman
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Woodall
Gingrey (GA)	Myrick	Yoder
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Young (FL)
Gosar	Nugent	Young (IN)
Gowdy	Nunnelee	
Graves (GA)	Olson	

NOES—256

Ackerman	Alexander	Amodei
Aderholt	Altmire	Andrews

Austria	Gallegly	Oliver
Baca	Garamendi	Owens
Bachus	Gerlach	Pallone
Baldwin	Gibson	Pascrell
Barber	Gonzalez	Pastor (AZ)
Barletta	Granger	Pearce
Bass (CA)	Green, Al	Pelosi
Bass (NH)	Green, Gene	Perlmutter
Becerra	Grijalva	Peters
Berg	Gutierrez	Peterson
Berkley	Hahn	Pingree (ME)
Berman	Hanabusa	Platts
Biggert	Harper	Polis
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Price (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (WA)	Quigley
Bishop (UT)	Hayworth	Rahall
Blumenauer	Heck	Rangel
Bonamici	Heinrich	Reed
Bonner	Higgins	Rehberg
Bono Mack	Himes	Reyes
Boren	Hinchev	Richardson
Boswell	Hinojosa	Richmond
Brady (PA)	Hirono	Rivera
Braley (IA)	Hochul	Roby
Brown (FL)	Holden	Rogers (AL)
Butterfield	Holt	Rogers (KY)
Calvert	Honda	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Hoyer	Ross (AR)
Capito	Hunter	Rothman (NJ)
Capps	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Runyan
Cardoza	(TX)	Ruppersberger
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Carney	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Carter	Kelly	T.
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Chandler	Kind	Sarbanes
Chu	King (NY)	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Kinzing (IL)	Schiff
Clarke (MI)	Kissell	Schock
Clarke (NY)	Kucinich	Schrader
Clay	Langevin	Schwartz
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Coffman (CO)	Latham	Serrano
Cohen	LaTourette	Sewell
Cole	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Connolly (VA)	Levin	Shimkus
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Shuler
Cooper	Lipinski	Simpson
Costa	Loeb sack	Sires
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Courtney	Lowe y	Smith (WA)
Crawford	Lucas	Speier
Crenshaw	Luján	Stark
Critz	Lungren, Daniel	Sutton
Crowley	E.	Thompson (CA)
Cuellar	Lynch	Thompson (PA)
Cummings	Maloney	Tierney
Davis (CA)	Markey	Tipton
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Tonko
Davis (KY)	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
DeFazio	McCollum	Tsongas
DeGette	McDermott	Turner (NY)
DeLauro	McGovern	Turner (OH)
Dent	McIntyre	Van Hollen
Deutch	McKeon	Velázquez
Diaz-Balart	McKinley	Visclosky
Dicks	McNerney	Walden
Dingell	Meehan	Walz (MN)
Doggett	Meeks	Wasserman
Dold	Michaud	Schultz
Donnelly (IN)	Miller (NC)	Waters
Doyle	Miller, Gary	Watt
Edwards	Miller, George	Waxman
Ellison	Moore	Welch
Eshoo	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Farr	Murphy (CT)	Wolf
Fattah	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Filner	Nadler	Woolsey
Fitzpatrick	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Frank (MA)	Neal	Young (AK)
Frelinghuysen	Noem	
Fudge	Nunes	

NOT VOTING—8

Engel	Johnson, E. B.	Stivers
Gohmert	Lewis (CA)	Thompson (MS)
Jackson (IL)	Mack	

□ 1636

Ms. SEWELL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Messrs. CARTER, CRENSHAW, COFFMAN of Colorado, Mrs. BONO MACK, and

Messrs. ELLISON and HUNTER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. TERRY and ISSA changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the seventh amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 240, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

AYES—178

Adams	Gingrey (GA)	Miller (FL)
Akin	Goodlatte	Miller (MI)
Amash	Gosar	Mulvaney
Amodei	Gowdy	Murphy (PA)
Bachmann	Graves (GA)	Myrick
Barrow	Graves (MO)	Neugebauer
Bartlett	Griffin (AR)	Noem
Barton (TX)	Griffith (VA)	Nugent
Benish	Grimm	Nunnelee
Bilbray	Guinta	Olson
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Palazzo
Bishop (UT)	Hall	Paul
Black	Hanna	Paulsen
Blackburn	Harris	Petri
Bonner	Hartzler	Pitts
Bono Mack	Hensarling	Poe (TX)
Boustany	Herger	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Posey
Brooks	Huelskamp	Price (GA)
Broun (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Quayle
Buchanan	Hultgren	Reichert
Bucshon	Hunter	Renacci
Buerkle	Hurt	Ribble
Burgess	Issa	Rigell
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Roe (TN)
Camp	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Campbell	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Canseco	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Cassidy	Jones	Rooney
Chabot	Jordan	Roskam
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Ross (FL)
Coble	Kingston	Royce
Coffman (CO)	Kline	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	Labrador	Scalise
Culberson	Lamborn	Schilling
Denham	Lance	Schmidt
DesJarlais	Landry	Schweikert
Dreier	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Duffy	Latta	Scott, Austin
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (TN)	Long	Sessions
Ellmers	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
Emerson	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Farenthold	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (NJ)
Fincher	E.	Smith (TX)
Fitzpatrick	Manzullo	Southerland
Flake	Marchant	Stearns
Fleischmann	Marino	Stutzman
Fleming	Matheson	Terry
Flores	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Forbes	McCauley	Upton
Fortenberry	McClintock	Walberg
Fox	McCotter	Walden
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Walsh (IL)
Gardner	McIntyre	Webster
Garrett	McMorris	West
Gibbs	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Gibson	Mica	Whitfield

Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Woodall
Yoder

Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—240

Ackerman	Frelinghuysen	Owens
Aderholt	Fudge	Pallone
Alexander	Gallegly	Pascrell
Altmire	Garamendi	Pastor (AZ)
Austria	Gerlach	Pearce
Baca	Gonzalez	Pelosi
Bachus	Granger	Perlmutter
Baldwin	Green, Al	Peters
Barber	Green, Gene	Peterson
Barletta	Grijalva	Pingree (ME)
Bass (NH)	Gutierrez	Platts
Becerra	Hahn	Polis
Berg	Hanabusa	Price (NC)
Berkley	Harper	Quigley
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Rahall
Biggert	Hastings (WA)	Rangel
Bishop (GA)	Hayworth	Reed
Bishop (NY)	Heck	Rehberg
Blumenauer	Heinrich	Reyes
Bonamici	Higgins	Richardson
Boren	Himes	Richmond
Boswell	Hinchev	Rivera
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Roby
Braley (IA)	Hirono	Rogers (AL)
Brown (FL)	Hochul	Rogers (KY)
Butterfield	Holden	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Holt	Ross (AR)
Capito	Honda	Rothman (NJ)
Capps	Hoyer	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Israel	Runyan
Cardoza	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Carnahan	(TX)	Rush
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Carter	Keating	T.
Castor (FL)	Kelly	Sanchez, Loretta
Chandler	Kildee	Sarbanes
Chu	Kind	Schakowsky
Cicilline	King (NY)	Schiff
Clarke (MI)	Kinzing (IL)	Schock
Clarke (NY)	Kissell	Schwartz
Clay	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Langevin	Scott, David
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Sewell
Cole	Latham	Sherman
Connolly (VA)	LaTourette	Shimkus
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Shuler
Cooper	Levin	Simpson
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Costello	Lipinski	Slaughter
Courtney	Loeb sack	Smith (WA)
Crawford	Lofgren, Zoe	Speier
Crenshaw	Lowe y	Stark
Critz	Lucas	Sutton
Crowley	Luján	Thompson (CA)
Cuellar	Lynch	Thompson (PA)
Cummings	Maloney	Tiberi
Davis (CA)	Markey	Tierney
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Tipton
Davis (KY)	McCarthy (NY)	Tonko
DeFazio	McCollum	Towns
DeGette	McDermott	Tsongas
DeLauro	McGovern	Turner (NY)
Dent	McKeon	Turner (OH)
Deutch	McKinley	Van Hollen
Diaz-Balart	McNerney	Velázquez
Dicks	Meehan	Visclosky
Dingell	Meeks	Walz (MN)
Doggett	Michaud	Wasserman
Dold	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Donnelly (IN)	Miller, Gary	Waters
Doyle	Miller, George	Watt
Edwards	Moore	Waxman
Ellison	Moran	Welch
Eshoo	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Farr	Nadler	Wolf
Fattah	Napolitano	Womack
Filner	Neal	Woolsey
Fitzpatrick	Nunes	Yarmuth
Frank (MA)	Oliver	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews	Jackson (IL)	Schrader
Bass (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Stivers
Cantor	Lewis (CA)	Sullivan
Engel	Mack	Thompson (MS)
Gohmert	Pence	

□ 1640

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF
GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the eighth amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROWN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 248, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

AYES—174

Adams	Gosar	Nugent
Akin	Gowdy	Nunnelee
Amash	Graves (GA)	Olson
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Paul
Barrow	Griffith (VA)	Paulsen
Bartlett	Grimm	Pence
Barton (TX)	Guinta	Petri
Benishek	Guthrie	Pitts
Bilbray	Hanna	Poe (TX)
Bilirakis	Harris	Pompeo
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Posay
Black	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Herger	Quayle
Bono Mack	Huelskamp	Reichert
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Ribble
Brooks	Hunter	Rigell
Brown (GA)	Hurt	Roe (TN)
Buchanan	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Bucshon	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Buerkle	Johnson (IL)	Rokita
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Camp	Jones	Ross (FL)
Campbell	Jordan	Royce
Canseco	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Kingston	Scalise
Cassidy	Kline	Schilling
Chabot	Labrador	Schmidt
Chaffetz	Lamborn	Schweikert
Coble	Lance	Scott (SC)
Coffman (CO)	Landry	Scott, Austin
Conaway	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Culberson	Latta	Sessions
Denham	LoBiondo	Shuster
DesJarlais	Long	Smith (NE)
Dreier	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Duffy	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Duncan (SC)	Manzullo	Stearns
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Stutzman
Ellmers	Marino	Terry
Emerson	Matheson	Thornberry
Farenthold	McCarthy (CA)	Upton
Fincher	McCaul	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Walsh (IL)
Flake	McCotter	Webster
Fleischmann	McHenry	West
Fleming	McIntyre	Westmoreland
Flores	McMorris	Whitfield
Forbes	Rodgers	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Mica	Wittman
Fox	Miller (FL)	Woodall
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Yoder
Gardner	Mulvaney	Young (FL)
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Young (IN)
Gibbs	Myrick	
Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer	
Goodlatte	Noem	

NOES—248

Ackerman	Bachus	Becerra
Aderholt	Baldwin	Berg
Alexander	Barber	Berkley
Altmire	Barletta	Berman
Austria	Bass (CA)	Biggert
Baca	Bass (NH)	Bishop (GA)

Bishop (NY)	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Harper	Peters
Bonamici	Hastings (FL)	Peterson
Bonner	Hastings (WA)	Pingree (ME)
Boren	Hayworth	Platts
Boswell	Heck	Polis
Brady (PA)	Heinrich	Price (NC)
Braley (IA)	Herrera Beutler	Quigley
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Rahall
Butterfield	Himes	Rangel
Calvert	Hinchee	Reed
Capito	Hinojosa	Rehberg
Capps	Hirono	Reyes
Capuano	Hochul	Richardson
Cardoza	Holden	Richmond
Carnahan	Holt	Rivera
Carney	Honda	Roby
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Rogers (AL)
Carter	Israel	Rogers (KY)
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Ros-Lehtinen
Chandler	(TX)	Ross (AR)
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Rothman (NJ)
Cicilline	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (MI)	Keating	Runyan
Clarke (NY)	Kelly	Ruppersberger
Clay	Kildee	Rush
Cleaver	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	King (NY)	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	Kinzinger (IL)	T.
Cole	Kissell	Sanchez, Loretta
Connolly (VA)	Kucinich	Sarbanes
Cooper	Langevin	Schakowsky
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Costello	Larson (CT)	Schock
Courtney	Latham	Schrader
Cravaack	LaTourette	Schwartz
Crawford	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Crenshaw	Levin	Scott, David
Critz	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Crowley	Lipinski	Sewell
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Sherman
Cummings	Loftgren, Zoe	Shimkus
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Shuler
Davis (IL)	Lucas	Simpson
Davis (KY)	Lujan	Sires
DeFazio	Lungrén, Daniel	Slaughter
DeGette	E.	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lynch	Southerland
Dent	Maloney	Speier
Deutch	Markey	Stark
Diaz-Balart	Matsui	Sullivan
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Sutton
Dingell	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McDermott	Thompson (PA)
Dold	McGovern	Tiberi
Donnelly (IN)	McKeon	Tierney
Doyle	McKinley	Tipton
Edwards	McNerney	Tonko
Ellison	Meehan	Towns
Engel	Meeks	Tsongas
Eshoo	Michaud	Turner (NY)
Farr	Miller (NC)	Turner (OH)
Fattah	Miller, Gary	Van Hollen
Filner	Miller, George	Velázquez
Frank (MA)	Moore	Visclosky
Frelinghuysen	Moran	Walz (MN)
Fudge	Murphy (CT)	Wasserman
Gallegly	Nadler	Schultz
Garamendi	Napolitano	Waters
Gerlach	Neal	Watt
Gibson	Nunes	Waxman
Gonzalez	Olver	Welch
Granger	Owens	Wilson (FL)
Green, Al	Pallone	Wolf
Green, Gene	Pascrell	Womack
Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Pearce	Yarmuth
Hahn	Pelosi	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Andrews	Jackson (IL)	Stivers
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Thompson (MS)
Gohmert	Lewis (CA)	
Hall	Mack	

□ 1644

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF
GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the ninth amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROWN) on which further proceedings

were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 229, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

AYES—193

Adams	Gosar	Myrick
Akin	Gowdy	Neugebauer
Amash	Graves (GA)	Noem
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Nugent
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Nunnelee
Barrow	Griffith (VA)	Olson
Bartlett	Grimm	Palazzo
Barton (TX)	Guinta	Paul
Benishek	Guthrie	Paulsen
Bilbray	Hanna	Pearce
Bilirakis	Harris	Pence
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Perlmutter
Black	Hensarling	Petri
Blackburn	Herger	Pitts
Bonner	Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)
Bono Mack	Huelskamp	Polis
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Posay
Brooks	Hunter	Price (GA)
Brown (GA)	Hurt	Quayle
Buchanan	Issa	Reichert
Bucshon	Jenkins	Renacci
Buerkle	Johnson (IL)	Ribble
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Roe (TN)
Camp	Jones	Rogers (MI)
Campbell	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Canseco	King (IA)	Rokita
Cantor	Kingston	Rooney
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Roskam
Chabot	Kissell	Ross (FL)
Chaffetz	Kline	Royce
Coble	Labrador	Ryan (WI)
Coffman (CO)	Lamborn	Scalise
Cole	Lance	Schilling
Conaway	Landry	Schweikert
Cravaack	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Culberson	Latta	Scott, Austin
DeFazio	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Denham	Long	Sessions
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Shimkus
DesJarlais	Lummis	Shuster
Dreier	Lungrén, Daniel	Smith (NE)
Duffy	E.	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (SC)	Lynch	Smith (TX)
Duncan (TN)	Manzullo	Southerland
Ellmers	Marchant	Stearns
Emerson	Marino	Stutzman
Farenthold	Matheson	Sullivan
Fincher	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Fitzpatrick	McCaul	Thornberry
Flake	McClintock	Upton
Fleischmann	McCotter	Walberg
Fleming	McHenry	Walsh (IL)
Flores	McIntyre	Webster
Forbes	McMorris	West
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Fox	McNerney	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Frankson (AZ)	Wilson (SC)
Gardner	Gallegly	Wittman
Garrett	Gardner	Woodall
Gibbs	Garrett	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Gibbs	Young (FL)
Goodlatte	Gingrey (GA)	Young (IN)
	Goodlatte	

NOES—229

Barber	Bishop (GA)
Barletta	Bishop (NY)
Bass (CA)	Blumenauer
Bass (NH)	Bonamici
Becerra	Boren
Berg	Boswell
Berkley	Brady (PA)
Berman	Braley (IA)
Biggert	Brown (FL)

Butterfield Heck
Capito Heinrich
Capps Higgins
Capuano Himes
Cardoza Hinchey
Carnahan Hinojosa
Carney Hirono
Carson (IN) Hochul
Carter Holden
Castor (FL) Holt
Chandler Honda
Chu Hoyer
Cicilline Israel
Clarke (MI) Jackson Lee
Clarke (NY) (TX)
Clay Johnson (GA)
Cleaver Kaptur
Clyburn Keating
Cohen Kelly
Connolly (VA) Kildee
Conyers Kind
Cooper King (NY)
Costa Kucinich
Costello Langevin
Courtney Larsen (WA)
Crawford Larson (CT)
Crenshaw Latham
Critz LaTourette
Crowley Lee (CA)
Cuellar Levin
Cummings Lewis (GA)
Davis (CA) Lipinski
Davis (IL) Loeb sack
Davis (KY) Lofgren, Zoe
DeGette Lowey
DeLauro Lucas
Deutch Lujan
Diaz-Balart Maloney
Dicks Markey
Dingell Matsui
Doggett McCarthy (NY)
Dold McCollum
Donnelly (IN) McDermott
Doyle McGovern
Edwards McKeon
Ellison McKinley
Engel Meeks
Eshoo Michaud
Farr Miller (NC)
Fattah Miller, George
Filner Moore
Frank (MA) Moran
Frelinghuysen Murphy (CT)
Fudge Nadler
Garamendi Napolitano
Gerlach Neal
Gibson Nunes
Gonzalez Oliver
Granger Owens
Green, Al Pallone
Green, Gene Pascrell
Grijalva Pastor (AZ)
Gutierrez Pelosi
Hahn Peters
Hanabusa Peterson
Harper Pingree (ME)
Hastings (FL) Platts
Hastings (WA) Price (NC)
Hayworth Quigley

NOT VOTING—10

Burton (IN) Johnson, E. B.
Gohmert Lewis (CA)
Hall Mack
Jackson (IL) Schmidt

□ 1648

Mr. CUMMINGS changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the tenth amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE
The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 247, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

AYES—178

Adams Gowdy
Akin Graves (GA)
Amash Graves (MO)
Amodei Griffin (AR)
Bachmann Griffith (VA)
Barrow Grimm
Bartlett Guinta
Barton (TX) Guthrie
Benishek Hall
Bilbray Hanna
Bilirakis Harris
Bishop (UT) Hartzler
Black Hensarling
Blackburn Herger
Bonner Herrera Beutler
Bono Mack Huelskamp
Boustany Huizenga (MI)
Brady (TX) Hultgren
Brooks Hunter
Broun (GA) Hurt
Buchanan Issa
Bucshon Jenkins
Buerkle Johnson (IL)
Burgess Johnson (OH)
Burton (IN) Johnson, Sam
Camp Jones
Campbell Jordan
Canseco King (IA)
Cassidy Kingston
Chabot Kinzinger (IL)
Chaffetz Kline
Coble Labrador
Conaway Lamborn
Lance
Culberson Landry
Denham Lankford
DesJarlais Latta
Dreier LoBiondo
Duffy Long
Duncan (SC) Luetkemeyer
Duncan (TN) Lummis
Elmers Manullo
Emerson Stearns
Farenthold Marrant
Fincher Marino
Fitzpatrick Matheson
Flake McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris
Rodgers
Franks (AZ) Mica
Gardner Miller (FL)
Garrett Miller (MI)
Gibbs Mulvaney
Gingrey (GA) Myrick
Goodlatte Neugebauer
Gosar Noem

NOES—247

Ackerman Boren
Aderholt Boswell
Alexander Brady (PA)
Altmire Braley (IA)
Andrews Brown (FL)
Austria Butterfield
Baca Calvert
Bachus Cantor
Baldwin Capito
Barber Capps
Barietta Capuano
Bass (CA) Cardoza
Bass (NH) Carnahan
Becerra Carney
Berg Carson (IN)
Berkley Carter
Berman Castor (FL)
Biggert Chandler
Bishop (GA) Chu
Bishop (NY) Chu
Blumenauer Cicilline
Bonamici Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY) DeFazio

DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Lewis (CA)
Mack
Stivers

NOT VOTING—7

Gohmert
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.

□ 1652

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the eleventh amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 250, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

AYES—169

Adams	Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer
Akin	Goodlatte	Noem
Amash	Gosar	Nugent
Amodei	Gowdy	Nunnelee
Austria	Graves (GA)	Olson
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Barrow	Griffin (AR)	Paul
Bartlett	Griffith (VA)	Paulsen
Barton (TX)	Grimm	Pearce
Benishek	Guinta	Pence
Bilbray	Guthrie	Petri
Bilirakis	Hall	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Poe (TX)
Black	Hartzler	Pompeo
Blackburn	Hensarling	Posey
Bono Mack	Herger	Price (GA)
Boustany	Huelskamp	Quayle
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Reichert
Brooks	Hultgren	Renacci
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Ribble
Buchanan	Hurt	Rigell
Bucshon	Issa	Roe (TN)
Buerkle	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Rokita
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Rooney
Campbell	Jones	Roskam
Canseco	Jordan	Ross (FL)
Cantor	King (IA)	Royce
Cassidy	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Chaffetz	Kline	Schilling
Coble	Labrador	Schmidt
Conaway	Lamborn	Schweikert
Cravaack	Lance	Scott (SC)
Culberson	Landry	Scott, Austin
Denham	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
DesJarlais	Latta	Sessions
Dreier	Long	Smith (NE)
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Stearns
Duncan (TN)	Manzullo	Stutzman
Ellmers	Marchant	Sullivan
Emerson	Marino	Terry
Farenthold	Matheson	Thornberry
Fincher	McCarthy (CA)	Upton
Flake	McCaul	Walberg
Fleischmann	McClintock	West
Fleming	McCotter	Westmoreland
Flores	McHenry	Whitfield
Forbes	McMorris	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Wittman
Fox	Mica	Woodall
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Yoder
Gardner	Miller (MI)	Young (FL)
Garrett	Mulvaney	Young (IN)
Gibbs	Myrick	

NOES—250

Ackerman	Carney	Deutch
Aderholt	Carson (IN)	Diaz-Balart
Alexander	Carter	Dicks
Altmire	Castor (FL)	Dingell
Andrews	Chandler	Doggett
Baca	Chu	Dold
Bachus	Cicilline	Donnelly (IN)
Baldwin	Clarke (MI)	Doyle
Barber	Clarke (NY)	Edwards
Barletta	Clay	Ellison
Bass (NH)	Cleaver	Engel
Becerra	Clyburn	Eshoo
Berg	Coffman (CO)	Farr
Berkley	Cohen	Fattah
Berman	Cole	Filner
Biggart	Connolly (VA)	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Frank (MA)
Bishop (NY)	Costa	Frelinghuysen
Blumenauer	Costello	Fudge
Bonamici	Courtney	Gallely
Bonner	Crawford	Garamendi
Boren	Crenshaw	Gerlach
Boswell	Critz	Gibson
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Granger
Braley (IA)	Cuellar	Green, Al
Brown (FL)	Cummings	Green, Gene
Butterfield	Davis (CA)	Grijalva
Calvert	Davis (IL)	Gutierrez
Capito	Davis (KY)	Hahn
Capps	DeFazio	Hanabusa
Capuano	DeGette	Hanna
Cardoza	DeLauro	Harper
Carnahan	Dent	Hastings (FL)

Hastings (WA)	McIntyre	Sanchez, Loretta
Hayworth	McKeon	Sarbanes
Heck	McKinley	Schiff
Heinrich	McNerney	Schock
Herrera Beutler	Meehan	Schrader
Higgins	Michaud	Schwartz
Himes	Miller (NC)	Scott (VA)
Hinchey	Miller, Gary	Scott, David
Hinojosa	Miller, George	Serrano
Hirono	Moore	Sewell
Hochul	Moran	Sherman
Holden	Murphy (CT)	Shimkus
Holt	Murphy (PA)	Shuler
Honda	Nadler	Shuster
Hoyer	Napolitano	Simpson
Israel	Neal	Sires
Jackson Lee	Nunes	Slaughter
(TX)	Olver	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (GA)	Owens	Smith (WA)
Kaptur	Pallone	Southerland
Keating	Pascarell	Speier
Kelly	Pastor (AZ)	Stark
Kildee	Pelosi	Sutton
Kind	Perlmutter	Thompson (CA)
King (NY)	Peters	Thompson (PA)
Kissell	Peterson	Tiberi
Kucinich	Pingree (ME)	Tierney
Langevin	Platts	Tipton
Larsen (WA)	Polis	Tonko
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Towns
Latham	Quigley	Tsongas
LaTourette	Rahall	Turner (NY)
Lee (CA)	Rangel	Turner (OH)
Levin	Reed	Van Hollen
Lewis (GA)	Rehberg	Velazquez
Lipinski	Reyes	Visclosky
LoBiondo	Richardson	Walden
Loeb sack	Richmond	Walsh (IL)
Lofgren, Zoe	Rivera	Walz (MN)
Lowe	Roby	Wasserman
Lucas	Rogers (AL)	Schultz
Lujan	Rogers (KY)	Watt
Lungren, Daniel	Ros-Lehtinen	Waxman
E.	Ross (AR)	Webster
Lynch	Rothman (NJ)	Welch
Maloney	Roybal-Allard	Fleming
Markey	Runyan	Wilson (FL)
Matsui	Ruppersberger	Wolf
McCarthy (NY)	Rush	Womack
McCollum	Ryan (OH)	Woolsey
McDermott	Sánchez, Linda	Yarmuth
McGovern	T.	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—13

Bass (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Stivers
Conyers	Lewis (CA)	Thompson (MS)
Gohmert	Mack	Waters
Gonzalez	Meeks	
Jackson (IL)	Schakowsky	

□ 1655

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
Stated against:
Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 429, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the twelfth amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 264, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

AYES—160

Adams	Graves (GA)	Nunnelee
Akin	Graves (MO)	Olson
Amash	Griffin (AR)	Palazzo
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)	Paul
Barrow	Grimm	Paulsen
Bartlett	Guinta	Pearce
Barton (TX)	Guthrie	Pence
Benishek	Hall	Perlmutter
Bilbray	Hartzler	Petri
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Pitts
Black	Herger	Poe (TX)
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Pompeo
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Posey
Brady (TX)	Huntgren	Price (GA)
Brooks	Hunter	Quayle
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Ribble
Buchanan	Issa	Rigell
Bucshon	Jenkins	Roe (TN)
Buerkle	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Camp	Jones	Rooney
Campbell	Jordan	Roskam
Canseco	King (IA)	Ross (FL)
Cantor	Kingston	Royce
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Kline	Scalise
Chaffetz	Labrador	Schilling
Coble	Lamborn	Schmidt
Conaway	Lance	Schweikert
Cravaack	Landry	Scott (SC)
Culberson	Lankford	Scott, Austin
Denham	Latta	Sensenbrenner
DesJarlais	Long	Sessions
Dreier	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Duffy	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Duncan (SC)	Manzullo	Stearns
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Stutzman
Ellmers	Marino	Sullivan
Emerson	Matheson	Terry
Farenthold	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Fincher	McCaul	Upton
Flake	McClintock	Walberg
Fleischmann	McCotter	West
Fleming	McHenry	Westmoreland
Flores	McMorris	Whitfield
Forbes	McMorris	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Wittman
Fox	Mica	Woodall
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Yoder
Gardner	Miller (MI)	Young (FL)
Garrett	Mulvaney	Young (IN)
Gibbs	Myrick	

NOES—264

Ackerman	Carson (IN)	Donnelly (IN)
Aderholt	Carter	Doyle
Alexander	Castor (FL)	Edwards
Altmire	Chandler	Ellison
Amodel	Chu	Engel
Andrews	Cicilline	Eshoo
Austria	Clarke (MI)	Farr
Baca	Clarke (NY)	Fattah
Bachus	Clay	Filner
Baldwin	Cleaver	Fitzpatrick
Barber	Clyburn	Frank (MA)
Barletta	Coffman (CO)	Frelinghuysen
Bass (CA)	Cohen	Fudge
Bass (NH)	Cole	Gallely
Becerra	Connolly (VA)	Garamendi
Berg	Conyers	Gerlach
Berkley	Cooper	Gibbs
Berman	Costa	Gibson
Biggart	Costello	Gonzalez
Bilirakis	Courtney	Granger
Bishop (GA)	Cravaack	Green, Al
Bishop (NY)	Crawford	Green, Gene
Blumenauer	Crenshaw	Grijalva
Bonamici	Critz	Gutierrez
Bonner	Crowley	Hahn
Bono Mack	Cuellar	Hanabusa
Boren	Cummings	Hanna
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Harper
Brady (PA)	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Braley (IA)	Davis (KY)	Hastings (WA)
Brown (FL)	DeFazio	Hayworth
Bucshon	DeGette	Heck
Butterfield	DeLauro	Heinrich
Calvert	Dent	Herrera Beutler
Capito	Deutch	Higgins
Capps	Diaz-Balart	Himes
Capuano	Dicks	Hinchey
Cardoza	Cardoza	Hinojosa
Carnahan	Doggett	Hirono
Carney	Dold	Hochul

Holden	Miller, Gary	Shock	Broun (GA)	Herger	Paul	Levin	Peterson	Shimkus
Holt	Miller, George	Schrader	Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Paulsen	Lewis (GA)	Pingree (ME)	Shuler
Honda	Moore	Schwartz	Bucshon	Huelskamp	Pearce	Lipinski	Platts	Shuster
Hoyer	Moran	Scott (VA)	Buerkle	Huizenga (MI)	Pence	Loeb sack	Price (NC)	Simpson
Israel	Murphy (CT)	Scott, David	Burgess	Hultgren	Petri	Lofgren, Zoe	Quigley	Sires
Jackson Lee	Murphy (PA)	Serrano	Burton (IN)	Hunter	Pitts	Lowe y	Rahall	Slaughter
(TX)	Nadler	Sewell	Camp	Hurt	Poe (TX)	Lucas	Rangel	Smith (WA)
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Sherman	Campbell	Issa	Polis	Luján	Reed	Speier
Kaptur	Neal	Shimkus	Canseco	Jenkins	Pompeo	Lynch	Rehberg	Stark
Keating	Nunes	Shuler	Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Posey	Maloney	Reyes	Sutton
Kelly	Olver	Shuster	Cassidy	Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)	Markey	Richardson	Terry
Kildee	Owens	Simpson	Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Quayle	Matsui	Richmond	Thompson (CA)
Kind	Pallone	Sires	Chaffetz	Jones	Reichert	McCollum	Rigell	Thompson (PA)
King (NY)	Pascrell	Slaughter	Conaway	Jordan	Renacci	McDermott	Rivera	Tiberi
Kissell	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (NJ)	Culberson	King (IA)	Ribble	McGovern	Roby	Tierney
Kucinich	Pelosi	Smith (WA)	Denham	Kingston	Roe (TN)	McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Tipton
Langevin	Peters	Southerland	DesJarlais	Kline	Rogers (MI)	McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Tonko
Larsen (WA)	Peterson	Speier	Dreier	Labrador	Rohrabacher	McNerney	Ros-Lehtinen	Towns
Larson (CT)	Pingree (ME)	Stark	Duffy	Lamborn	Rokita	Meeks	Ross (AR)	Tsongas
Latham	Platts	Sutton	Duncan (SC)	Lance	Rooney	Michaud	Rothman (NJ)	Turner (NY)
LaTourette	Polis	Thompson (CA)	Duncan (TN)	Landry	Roskam	Miller (NC)	Roybal-Allard	Turner (OH)
Lee (CA)	Price (NC)	Thompson (PA)	Ellmers	Lankford	Ross (FL)	Miller, Gary	Runyan	Van Hollen
Levin	Quigley	Tiberi	Emerson	LoBiondo	Royce	Miller, George	Ruppersberger	Velázquez
Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Tierney	Farenthold	Long	Ryan (WI)	Moore	Rush	Visclosky
Lipinski	Rangel	Tipton	Fincher	Luetkemeyer	Scalise	Moran	Ryan (OH)	Walz (MN)
LoBiondo	Reed	Tonko	Fitzpatrick	Lummis	Schilling	Murphy (CT)	Sánchez, Linda	Wasserman
Loeb sack	Rehberg	Towns	Flake	Lungren, Daniel	Schmidt	Murphy (PA)	T. Schultz	Waters
Lofgren, Zoe	Reichert	Tsongas	Fleischmann	E.	Schweikert	Nadler	Sanchez, Loretta	Watt
Lowe y	Renacci	Turner (NY)	Fleming	Manzullo	Scott (SC)	Napolitano	Sarbanes	Waxman
Lucas	Reyes	Turner (OH)	Flores	Marchant	Scott, Austin	Neal	Schakowsky	Welch
Luján	Richardson	Van Hollen	Fortenberry	Marino	Sensenbrenner	Nunes	Schiff	West
Lungren, Daniel	Richmond	Velázquez	Fox x	Matheson	Sessions	Olver	Schock	Wilson (FL)
E.	Rivera	Visclosky	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NE)	Owens	Schrader	Wittman
Lynch	Roby	Walden	Gardner	McCa ul	Smith (NJ)	Pallone	Schwartz	Wolf
Maloney	Rogers (AL)	Walz (MN)	Garrett	McClintock	Smith (TX)	Pascrell	Scott (VA)	Womack
Markey	Rogers (KY)	Wasserman	Gibbs	McCotter	Southerland	Pastor (AZ)	Scott, David	Woolsey
Matheson	Ros-Lehtinen	Schultz	Gingrey (GA)	McHenry	Stearns	Pelosi	Serrano	Yarmuth
Matsui	Ross (AR)	Waters	Goodlatte	McIntyre	Stutzman	Perlmutter	Sewell	Young (AK)
McCarthy (CA)	Rothman (NJ)	Watt	Gosar	McMorris	Sullivan	Peters	Sherman	
McCarthy (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Waxman	Gowdy	Rodgers	Thornberry			
McCollum	Runyan	Webster	Graves (GA)	Meehan	Upton			
McDermott	Ruppersberger	Welch	Graves (MO)	Mica	Walberg			
McGovern	Rush	Wilson (FL)	Griffin (AR)	Miller (FL)	Walden			
McKeon	Ryan (OH)	Wolf	Griffith (VA)	Miller (MI)	Walsh (IL)			
McKinley	Sánchez, Linda	Womack	Grimm	Mulvaney	Webster			
McNerney	T.	Woolsey	Guinta	Hall	Myrick			
Meehan	Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth	Guthrie	Hanna	Neugebauer			
Meeks	Sarbanes	Young (AK)	Hall	Hartzler	Noem			
Michaud	Schakowsky		Hanna	Heck	Nugent			
Miller (NC)	Schiff		Hartzler	Hensarling	Nunnelee			
			Heck		Olson			
			Hensarling		Palazzo			

NOT VOTING—8

Gohmert Johnson, E. B. Stivers
Harris Lewis (CA) Thompson (MS)
Jackson (IL) Mack

□ 1658

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the thirteenth amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 249, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

AYES—172

Adams Barton (TX) Black
Amash Benishek Blackburn
Amodei Berg Bono Mack
Austria Bilbray Boustany
Bachmann Bilirakis Brady (TX)
Barrow Bishop (UT) Brooks

NOES—249

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barietta
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn

Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach

Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinche y
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)

Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe y
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)

Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Riversa
Robby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman

Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Akin Jackson (IL) McCarthy (NY)
Carson (IN) Johnson, E. B. Stivers
DeFazio Lewis (CA) Thompson (MS)
Gohmert Mack

□ 1702

Mr. POLIS changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the fourteenth amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 250, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

AYES—172

Adams Bonner Canseco
Akin Bono Mack Cantor
Amash Boustany Capito
Amodei Brady (TX) Cassidy
Austria Brooks Chabot
Bachmann Broun (GA) Chaffetz
Barrow Buchanan Coble
Bartlett Bucshon Coffman (CO)
Benishek Buerkle Conaway
Bilbray Burgess Cravaack
Bishop (UT) Burton (IN) Culberson
Black Camp Denham
Blackburn Campbell DesJarlais

Dreier	Jordan	Posey	Meeks	Richmond	Speier	Huelskamp	McClintock	Rohrabacher
Duffy	King (IA)	Price (GA)	Michaud	Rivera	Stark	Huizenga (MI)	McHenry	Rokita
Duncan (SC)	Kingston	Quayle	Miller (NC)	Roby	Sutton	Hultgren	McMorris	Rooney
Duncan (TN)	Kinzing (IL)	Renacci	Miller, Gary	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (CA)	Hunter	Rodgers	Ross (FL)
Ellmers		Ribble	Miller, George	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)	Hurt	Mica	Royce
Emerson	Labrador	Rigell	Moore	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiberi	Issa	Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)
Farenthold	Lamborn	Roe (TN)	Moran	Ross (AR)	Tierney	Jenkins	Miller (MI)	Scalise
Fincher	Lance	Rogers (MI)	Murphy (CT)	Rothman (NJ)	Tipton	Johnson (IL)	Mulvaney	Schmidt
Fitzpatrick	Landry	Rohrabacher	Nadler	Roybal-Allard	Tonko	Johnson (OH)	Murphy (PA)	Schweikert
Flake	Lankford	Rokita	Napolitano	Runyan	Towns	Johnson, Sam	Myrick	Scott (SC)
Fleischmann	Latta	Rooney	Neal	Ruppersberger	Tsongas	Jones	Neugebauer	Scott, Austin
Fleming	Long	Roskam	Nunes	Rush	Turner (NY)	Jordan	Nunes	Sensenbrenner
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Ross (FL)	Olver	Ryan (OH)	Turner (OH)	King (IA)	Nunnelee	Sessions
Forbes	Lummis	Royce	Owens	Sánchez, Linda T.	Van Hollen	Kingston	Olson	Simpson
Fox	Manzullo	Ryan (WI)	Pallone	Sanchez, Loretta	Velázquez	Kline	Palazzo	Smith (NE)
Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Scalise	Pascarell	Sarbanes	Visclosky	Labrador	Paul	Smith (TX)
Gardner	Marino	Schilling	Pastor (AZ)	Schakowsky	Walz (MN)	Lamborn	Paulsen	Stearns
Garrett	Matheson	Schmidt	Pelosi	Schiff	Wasserman	Lance	Pence	Stutzman
Gibbs	McCarthy (CA)	Schweikert	Perlmutter	Schock	Schultz	Landry	Petri	Sullivan
Gingrey (GA)	McCaul	Scott (SC)	Peters	Schrader	Waters	Lankford	Pitts	Thornberry
Goodlatte	McClintock	Scott, Austin	Peterson	Schwartz	Watt	Long	Poe (TX)	Upton
Gosar	McCotter	Sensenbrenner	Pingree (ME)	Scott (VA)	Waxman	Luetkemeyer	Pompeo	Walden
Gowdy	McHenry	Sessions	Platts	Scott, David	Webster	Lummis	Posey	Walsh (IL)
Graves (GA)	McMorris	Shimkus	Polis	Serrano	Welch	Lungren, Daniel E.	Price (GA)	Webster
Graves (MO)	Rodgers	Smith (NE)	Price (NC)	Sewell	West		Quayle	Westmoreland
Griffin (AR)	Mica	Smith (NJ)	Quigley	Sherman	Whitfield	Manzullo	Renacci	Wilson (SC)
Griffith (VA)	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)	Rahall	Shuler	Wilson (FL)	Marchant	Ribble	Wittman
Grimm	Miller (MI)	Southerland	Rangel	Shuster	Wolf	Marino	Rigell	Woodall
Guinta	Mulvaney	Stearns	Reed	Simpson	Womack	McCarthy (CA)	Roby	Yoder
Guthrie	Murphy (PA)	Stutzman	Rehberg	Sires	Woolsey	McCaul	Rogers (MI)	Young (IN)
Hall	Myrick	Sullivan	Reichert	Slaughter	Yarmuth			
Harris	Neugebauer	Terry	Reyes	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)			
Hartzer	Noem	Thornberry	Richardson					
Hensarling	Nugent	Upton						
Herger	Nunnelee	Walberg						
Huelskamp	Olson	Walden						
Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo	Walsh (IL)						
Hultgren	Paul	Westmoreland						
Hunter	Paulsen	Wilson (SC)						
Hurt	Pearce	Wittman						
Issa	Pence	Woodall						
Jenkins	Petri	Yoder						
Johnson (OH)	Pitts	Young (FL)						
Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)	Young (IN)						
Jones	Pompeo							

NOES—250

Ackerman	Courtney	Higgins
Aderholt	Crawford	Himes
Alexander	Crenshaw	Hinchee
Altmire	Critz	Hinojosa
Andrews	Crowley	Hirono
Baca	Cuellar	Hochul
Bachus	Cummings	Holden
Baldwin	Davis (CA)	Holt
Barber	Davis (IL)	Honda
Barletta	Davis (KY)	Hoyer
Barton (TX)	DeFazio	Israel
Bass (CA)	DeGette	Jackson Lee
Bass (NH)	DeLauro	(TX)
Becerra	Dent	Johnson (GA)
Berg	Deutch	Kaptur
Berkley	Diaz-Balart	Keating
Berman	Dicks	Kelly
Biggert	Dingell	Kildee
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Kind
Bishop (NY)	Dold	King (NY)
Blumenauer	Donnelly (IN)	Kissell
Bonamici	Doyle	Kucinich
Boren	Edwards	Langevin
Boswell	Ellison	Larsen (WA)
Brady (PA)	Engel	Larson (CT)
Braley (IA)	Eshoo	Latham
Brown (FL)	Farr	LaTourette
Butterfield	Fattah	Lee (CA)
Calvert	Filner	Levin
Capps	Fortenberry	Lewis (GA)
Capuano	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Cardoza	Fudge	LoBiondo
Carnahan	Gallely	Loeb sack
Carney	Garamendi	Lofgren, Zoe
Carson (IN)	Gerlach	Lowey
Carter	Gibson	Lucas
Castor (FL)	Gonzalez	Luján
Chandler	Granger	Lungren, Daniel E.
Chu	Green, Al	Lynch
Cicilline	Green, Gene	Maloney
Clarke (MI)	Grijalva	Markey
Clarke (NY)	Gutierrez	Matsui
Clay	Hahn	McCarthy (NY)
Cleaver	Hanabusa	McCollum
Clyburn	Hanna	McDermott
Cohen	Harper	McGovern
Cole	Hastings (FL)	McIntyre
Connolly (VA)	Hastings (WA)	McKeon
Conyers	Hayworth	McKinley
Cooper	Heck	McNerney
Costa	Heinrich	Meehan
Costello	Herrera Beutler	

NOT VOTING—10

Johnson (IL) Stivers
Johnson, E. B. Thompson (MS)
Lewis (CA)
Mack

□ 1705

The amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 267, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

AYES—157

Adams	Campbell	Forbes
Akin	Canseco	Fortenberry
Amash	Cantor	Fox
Amodei	Cassidy	Franks (AZ)
Bachmann	Chabot	Gardner
Bartlett	Chaffetz	Garrett
Barton (TX)	Coble	Gibbs
Benishke	Coffman (CO)	Gingrey (GA)
Bilbray	Conaway	Goodlatte
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Gosar
Black	Denham	Gowdy
Blackburn	Dreier	Graves (GA)
Bono Mack	Duffy	Graves (MO)
Boustany	Duncan (SC)	Griffin (AR)
Brady (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Griffin (VA)
Brooks	Ellmers	Grimm
Broun (GA)	Emerson	Guinta
Buchanan	Farenthold	Guthrie
Bucshon	Fincher	Hall
Buerkle	Flake	Harris
Burgess	Fleischmann	Hartzer
Burton (IN)	Fleming	Hensarling
Camp	Flores	Herger

NOES—267

Ackerman	DeFazio	Larsen (WA)
Aderholt	DeGette	Larson (CT)
Alexander	DeLauro	Latham
Altmire	Dent	LaTourette
Andrews	DesJarlais	Latta
Austria	Deutch	Lee (CA)
Baca	Diaz-Balart	Levin
Bachus	Dicks	Lewis (GA)
Baldwin	Dingell	Lipinski
Barber	Doggett	LoBiondo
Barletta	Dold	Loeb sack
Barrow	Donnelly (IN)	Lofgren, Zoe
Bass (CA)	Doyle	Lowey
Bass (NH)	Edwards	Lucas
Becerra	Ellison	Luján
Berg	Engel	Lynch
Berkley	Eshoo	Maloney
Berman	Farr	Markey
Biggert	Fattah	Matheson
Billirakis	Filner	Matsui
Bishop (GA)	Fitzpatrick	McCarthy (NY)
Bishop (NY)	Frelinghuysen	McCollum
Blumenauer	Fudge	McCotter
Bonamici	Gallely	McDermott
Bonner	Garamendi	McGovern
Boren	Gerlach	McIntyre
Boswell	Gibson	McKeon
Brady (PA)	Gonzalez	McKinley
Braley (IA)	Granger	McNerney
Brown (FL)	Green, Al	Meehan
Butterfield	Green, Gene	Meeks
Calvert	Grijalva	Michaud
Capito	Gutierrez	Miller (NC)
Capps	Hahn	Miller, Gary
Capuano	Hanabusa	Miller, George
Cardoza	Hanna	Moore
Carnahan	Harper	Moran
Carney	Hastings (FL)	Murphy (CT)
Carson (IN)	Hastings (WA)	Nadler
Carter	Hayworth	Napolitano
Castor (FL)	Heck	Neal
Chandler	Heinrich	Noem
Chu	Herrera Beutler	Nugent
Cicilline	Higgins	Olver
Clarke (MI)	Himes	Owens
Clarke (NY)	Hinchee	Pallone
Clay	Hinojosa	Pascarell
Cleaver	Hirono	Pastor (AZ)
Clyburn	Hochul	Pearce
Cohen	Holden	Pelosi
Cole	Holt	Perlmutter
Connolly (VA)	Honda	Peters
Conyers	Hoyer	Peterson
Cooper	Israel	Pingree (ME)
Costa	Jackson Lee	Platts
Costello	(TX)	Polis
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Crawford	Kaptur	Quigley
Crenshaw	Keating	Rahall
Critz	Kelly	Rangel
Crowley	Kildee	Reed
Cuellar	Kind	Rehberg
Cummings	King (NY)	Reichert
Davis (CA)	Kinzing (IL)	Reyes
Davis (IL)	Kissell	Richardson
Davis (KY)	Kucinich	Richmond
Davis (MI)	Langevin	Rivera

Roe (TN) Scott, David
 Rogers (AL) Serrano
 Rogers (KY) Sewell
 Ros-Lehtinen Sherman
 Roskam Shimkus
 Ross (AR) Shuler
 Rothman (NJ) Shuster
 Roybal-Allard Sires
 Runyan Slaughter
 Ruppertsberger Smith (NJ)
 Rush Smith (WA)
 Ryan (OH) Southerland
 Sánchez, Linda Speier
 T. Stark
 Sanchez, Loretta Sutton
 Sarbanes Terry
 Schakowsky Thompson (CA)
 Schiff Thompson (PA)
 Schilling Tiberi
 Schock Tierney
 Schrader Tipton
 Schwartz Tonko
 Scott (VA) Towns

NOT VOTING—8

Frank (MA) Johnson, E. B.
 Gohmert Lewis (CA)
 Jackson (IL) Mack

□ 1710

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the second amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 80, noes 342, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

AYES—80

Akin Gosar
 Amash Gowdy
 Bachmann Graves (GA)
 Bartlett Harris
 Black Hensarling
 Blackburn Herger
 Broun (GA) Huelskamp
 Burgess Huizenga (MI)
 Burton (IN) Hunter
 Campbell Issa
 Cantor Jenkins
 Cassidy Johnson (IL)
 Chabot Johnson, Sam
 Chaffetz Jordan
 Coble Labrador
 Conaway Lamborn
 Culberson Landry
 Denham Long
 Duncan (SC) Lummis
 Duncan (TN) Manzullo
 Flake McCaul
 Fleischmann McClintock
 Fleming McHenry
 Flores Mulvaney
 Foxx Neugebauer
 Franks (AZ) Nunes
 Garrett Nunnelee

Olson Paul
 Pence
 Petri
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Quayle
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Royce
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Stearns
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Walsh (IL)
 Webster
 Westmoreland
 Wilson (SC)
 Woodall
 Yoder

NOES—342

Ackerman Amodi
 Adams Andrews
 Aderholt Austria
 Alexander Baca
 Altmire Bachus

Baldwin
 Barber
 Barletta
 Barrow
 Barton (TX)

Bass (CA)
 Bass (NH)
 Becerra
 Benishek
 Berg
 Berkley
 Berman
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boren
 Boswell
 Boustany
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Braley (IA)
 Brooks
 Brown (FL)
 Buchanan
 Buchshon
 Buerkle
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Camp
 Canseco
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Carter
 Castor (FL)
 Chandler
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke (MI)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coffman (CO)
 Cohen
 Cole
 Connolly (VA)
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Cravaack
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Critz
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 Dent
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dold
 Donnelly (IN)
 Doyle
 Dreier
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Elmers
 Emerson
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Farenthold
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge

Gallegly
 Garamendi
 Gardner
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gonzalez
 Goodlatte
 Granger
 Graves (MO)
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hahn
 Hall
 Hanabusa
 Hanna
 Harper
 Hartzler
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayworth
 Heck
 Heinrich
 Herrera Beutler
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirose
 Hochul
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Hultgren
 Hurt
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 (TX)
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Jones
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly
 Kildee
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kissell
 Kline
 Kucinich
 Lance
 Langevin
 Lankford
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loebsack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Luján
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Maloney
 Marchant
 Marino
 Markey
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McCotter
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley

McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy (PA)
 Myrick
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Noem
 Nugent
 Oliver
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascarella
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Reyes
 Ribble
 Richardson
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Rivera
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (AR)
 Ross (FL)
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Runyan
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Speier
 Stark
 Sutton

Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Turner (NY)
 Turner (OH)

Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman

NOT VOTING—10

Frank (MA)
 Gohmert
 Gutierrez
 Jackson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Lewis (CA)
 Mack
 Miller (FL)
 Stivers
 Thompson (MS)

□ 1713

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 434, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR.

MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, noes 300, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

AYES—123

Adams
 Akin
 Amash
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bartlett
 Barton (TX)
 Benishek
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Bono Mack
 Boustany
 Brooks
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Buerkle
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Campbell
 Cantor
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Conaway
 Culberson
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Emerson
 Fincher
 Flake
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gingrey (GA)
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Hall
 Harris
 Hartsler
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan
 King (IA)
 Kingston
 Kline
 Labrador
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Landry
 Lankford
 Long
 Lummis
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Paul
 Pence
 Petri
 Poe (TX)
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Quayle
 Ribble
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Stearns
 Stutzman
 Thornberry

Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)

Webster
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woodall

NOES—300

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crisch
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold

Yoder
Young (IN)

Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Oliver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tipton

Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)

Bass (CA)
Frank (MA)
Gohmert

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)

Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Mack
Stivers
Thompson (MS)

Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Upton

NOES—242

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frelinghuysen

Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCormack
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meahan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oliver
Pallone

Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCormack
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meahan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oliver
Pallone

□ 1717

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 242, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

AYES—178

Adams
Akin
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishke
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cravaack
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake

Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry

Lankford
Latta
Lipinski
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)

NOT VOTING—12

Berg	Jackson (IL)	Paul
Bucshon	Johnson, E. B.	Rehberg
Frank (MA)	Lewis (CA)	Stivers
Gohmert	Mack	Thompson (MS)

□ 1720

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2015

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEST) at 8 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE REPORT 112-546 AND ACCOMPANYING RESOLUTION, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 706, AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM TO INITIATE OR INTERVENE IN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS TO ENFORCE CERTAIN SUBPOENAS

Mr. NUGENT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-553) on the resolution (H. Res. 708) relating to the consideration of House Report 112-546 and an accompanying resolution, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 706) authorizing the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT). Pursuant to House Resolu-

tion 697 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5972.

Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST) kindly take the chair.

□ 2017

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with Mr. WEST (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 11 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 150, line 9.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I want to begin by thanking the committee for its extraordinarily hard work in identifying ways to cut spending.

All of us hear from our constituents. They want us to reduce what the Federal Government spends, to be wise and proper stewards of the Federal taxpayer dollar. All too often, they look at Washington and they see a monument to waste of the American taxpayer dollar.

Mr. Chairman, for the legislation that is in front of us, the fiscal year 2013 proposed funding level is \$51.6 billion, which is \$1.9 billion below the President's request. I think it is admirable that we have saved nearly \$2 billion below the President's request. However, we know that there is much more work that can be done, that should be done, that must be done. Therefore, my 1 percent across-the-board spending reduction amendment will save taxpayers an additional \$516 million.

□ 2020

That is \$516 million that our children and our grandchildren will not have to pay back with interest.

I'm fully aware of the strong opposition that many appropriators have for these across-the-board spending cuts.

When I've offered these cuts, I have been told that "the cuts of this magnitude, quite honestly, go too deep." I've also heard that these 1 percent spending reductions would be "very damaging to our national security and to things that are important to life and property."

However, the taxpayers are demanding that the bureaucracy do what they are doing and save a penny on a dollar. Our Governors are quite active in this arena. Of course, we have heard from former Governor Mitt Romney, Governor Chris Christie, Governor Rick Perry, Governor Mitch Daniels, Governor Brian Schweitzer, Governor Chris Gregoire, just to name a few of our State executives. In the chairman's home State of Iowa, former Democratic Governor Chet Culver issued a 10 percent across-the-board spending reduction.

These across-the-board spending cuts are used around our country in a bipartisan fashion, and the reason they are is because they work. They work. This is how you get results, by actually cutting into the baseline and reducing the outlays of government. They are effective because they cut spending within each agency and force each agency to do a review and find the waste and find ways to preserve those precious dollars that are coming from the taxpayers.

Admiral Mullen made the statement that "the greatest risk to our Nation's security is our Nation's debt." Mr. Chairman, we all know that. The American people know this. They have grown ill and fatigued with what they see as waste of their money here in Washington because this government never satisfies its appetite for the taxpayers' dollar. Because of that, because they think they can go to the well and ask for more, because they think they can go to the presses and print those dollars, they don't do the hard work of prioritizing. That is what we're to do here in this House.

In that spirit of forcing the actions of prioritizing, forcing the actions of the bureaucracy, having to save one penny on a dollar so that our children and grandchildren are not paying that back with interest, that is the reason that I bring these amendments. It's important because right now we're borrowing 40 cents of every dollar that we spend. We cannot afford this. It is incumbent upon us to make certain that we do the hard work, that we cut a little more, that we make the demands on the bureaucracy that our constituents are making on their businesses and on their family budgets. It is time for us to save just a penny on a dollar, make the cut, do it for our children and future generations.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment.

This amendment indiscriminately cuts programs in transportation and housing without any thought to the relevant merits of the programs contained in this bill. For instance, they would result in fewer air traffic controllers, fewer pipeline safety inspectors that ensure that accidents do not occur, fewer vouchers for homeless veterans. It would reduce salaries and expense accounts for all the departments. In some of the agencies, salaries and expenses are almost everything in the agency. You would do the same thing for all the capital accounts, the construction accounts, since this is basically an infrastructure bill that has a lot of capital expenditures. All of this would be done across the board.

More generally, investments in our transportation and housing infrastructure will be reduced and the associated jobs will be lost. From the amendment itself, there will be public jobs lost. Also, there will be jobs lost because of the loss in infrastructure, which is important to this country and very critical.

I want to point out that the sponsor of this legislation is again renegeing on her word. She voted for last summer's Budget Control Act that set this year's spending limits. The Ryan budget broke that agreement and lowered spending levels. The sponsor's amendment breaks the agreement again by reducing discretionary funding even further.

I strongly urge Members to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, please.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her persistence and for all of her work as far as trying to get a handle on the spending.

I would just like to make a couple of points.

She mentioned that we're \$2 billion below the President's request. We're actually almost \$4 billion below last year's spending in this bill. We have the largest decrease, percentage-wise, of any of the appropriation bills. We have worked very hard to craft a bill that actually enacted those types of spending cuts but also funded the high-priority items that are in this bill. It's with reluctance I oppose her amendment.

I will just say that we're within the 302(b) allocations that were in the Ryan budget. That was really the debate then as to what funding levels to be at.

There are some very important infrastructure issues that would be harmed by this when we look at the highway trust fund funding that would be cut. Of course, that would also include transit programs, veterans homeless vouchers. We have done everything we could to try to have a balanced bill that actually created priorities after having

many hearings and working through this bill on a line-by-line basis. I'm not sure that an across-the-board cut that cuts everything arbitrarily is the way to go.

Certainly, we're all very concerned about the budget, but with reluctance, I oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to yield some time to the gentlelady.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the chairman for yielding, and as I said at the beginning, I applaud the committee for the good work they have done.

I think when you're broke, though, that what we have to do is say now is the time to make further cuts. And to the ranking member, it's not indiscriminate. This is the way our Governors have found to arrive at balancing a budget. It's looking at every agency and saying get in there, do the heavy lift and find this. The result we want is to preserve the foundation of this great Nation for our children and grandchildren.

Are you saying that salaries and expenses are more important than the future of these children who are going to have to pay this debt back with interest, \$16 trillion worth of debt and growing, and you've got to pay it back?

□ 2030

My two grandchildren, my children, is it fair to look at them and say, You're going to spend over half of what you earn? I know that it is tough.

As the gentleman inferred, I'm at it again. Yes, you're right, Mr. Chairman. I am at it again. And let me tell you something. I am going to be at it again and again and again, just as I have every single year that I have been a Member of this House because preserving the firm financial footing of this Nation is work, coming at it again and again and again until we get the job done.

It has worked for our cities. It has worked for our counties. It has worked for our States. It will work for this Nation that is so richly blessed. It means that we have to have titanium backbones to get the job done.

I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. LATHAM. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used for the Third Street Light Rail Phase 2 Central Subway project in San Francisco, California.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment forbids further Federal expenditures for the Central Subway project in San Francisco. This project is a 1.7-mile subway that is estimated to cost \$1.6 billion. And these cost estimates continue to rise. In fact, its baseline budget has more than doubled in 9 years and shows no sign of slowing. The current estimate brings the cost to nearly \$1 billion per mile. That's about five times the cost per lane-mile of Boston's scandalous Big Dig.

Now, it was supposed to link local light rail and bus lines with CalTrain and Bay Area Rapid Transit, but it's so badly designed that it bypasses 25 of the 30 light-rail and bus lines that it crosses. To add insult to insanity, it dismantles the seamless light rail to BART connection currently available to passengers at Market Street, requiring them, instead, to walk nearly a quarter mile to make the new connection. Experts estimate it will cost commuters between 5 and 10 minutes of additional commuting time on every segment of the route.

The Wall Street Journal calls it "a case study in government incompetence and wasted taxpayer money." And they're not alone. The civil grand jury in San Francisco has vigorously recommended the project be scrapped, warning that maintenance costs alone could ultimately bankrupt San Francisco's Muni. The former chairman of the San Francisco Transportation Agency has called it "one of the costliest mistakes in the city's history." Even the sponsors estimate that it will increase ridership by less than 1 percent, and there is vigorous debate that this project is far too optimistic.

I think Margaret Okuzumi, the executive director of the Bay Rail Alliance, put it best when she said:

Too many times, we've seen money for public transit used to primarily benefit people who would profit financially, while making transit less convenient for actual transit riders. Voters approve money for public transit because they want transit to be more convenient and available. It would be tragic if billions of dollars were spent on something that made Muni more time consuming, costly, and unable to sustain its overall transit service.

Mr. Chairman, this administration is attempting to put Federal taxpayers—that's our constituents—on the hook for nearly \$1 billion of the cost of this folly through the New Starts program. That's more than 60 percent of the entire project. We have already squandered \$123 million on it that we don't have. This amendment forbids another

dime of our constituents' money being wasted on this boondoggle.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you may be wondering, well, why should your constituents pay nearly \$1 billion for a purely local transportation project in San Francisco that is opposed by a broad bipartisan coalition of San Franciscans, including the Sierra Club, Save Muni—which is a grassroots organization of Muni riders—the Coalition of San Francisco Neighborhoods, and three of the four local newspapers serving San Francisco. Why, indeed. Excuse me, I don't have an answer to that question.

But those who vote against this amendment had better have one when their constituents ask what in the world were you thinking.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, from the looks of it, the gentleman from California has quite a fight going on with the Sierra Club, with three of the four major newspapers—I don't know which ones they are exactly. I didn't know there were four major newspapers in San Francisco. Most places these days, if they have one, they're doing very well—and with the State legislature in California as well.

I strongly oppose this amendment. And, frankly, I am disappointed by what it represents. This project, I think, is a perfect—well, maybe not perfect—is a very good example of the types of infrastructure projects our major urban areas need to remain economically strong, provide job creation now, and critical access to jobs in the future.

Six of the 50 largest metropolitan areas in this country—those with a population over 1 million—exist in the State of California. California also happens to have five additional ones which have 500,000 to 1 million in population. Seven of those 11 are growing by more than 25 percent per year. And these are exactly the sort of places—all of them—they are places that need investment, continued investment, and continued assistance from the Federal Government.

They are putting a major amount of money into our authorization plans, which we extend and are still under extension. And I think most people here hope and understand that we need to have a reauthorization sometime within the next few days, probably, and that the program in California is one that is fully authorized and ready to go.

Population density in the area that is involved in this particular program is over 50,000 people per square mile. Ultimately, the project will tie together one of the fastest-growing sections of San Francisco with one of the densest neighborhoods in the Nation and will provide key regional connec-

tions with other transit systems, including commuter rail and future high-speed rail programs.

The project has been thoroughly reviewed by the FTA and the State of California. Local authorities determined that it was of high value. In addition, the chairman included \$100 million in the underlying bill as an acknowledgement that this project is moving and will improve transportation and create construction jobs in the Bay Area. The Bay Area needs construction jobs as well as we need construction jobs in every part of this Nation in order to have a robust economy.

I have a press release, which arrived today, just to add to the game. The California Transportation Commission unanimously approved the commitment of \$61 million in State high-speed rail connectivity funds for the Central Subway Project, this very project, this very day.

□ 2040

I also have here with me the editorial from the San Francisco Examiner—I'm not sure whether that's one of your major newspapers in the area or not—in support of this program.

I understand that the sponsor might not support public transportation, but when he singles out one project of many that received a high rating, it's hard not to wonder if his opposition is not based on some kind of internal politics and not on sound policy.

I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

[From the Examiner, June 14, 2012]

CENTRAL SUBWAY NEEDS MONEY TO FULFILL POTENTIAL

It is time for everyone to get onboard with the Central Subway project—the largest Muni project in recent years.

This week, the excavation of nearly a full block in San Francisco began as construction workers started ripping up the streets around Fourth and Bryant. The project is for a launch box," the staging ground for next year, when two massive hole-boring machines will ultimately serve as the tunnel for the new Central Subway line.

If you believe the naysayers, this tunneling is the beginning of a train to nowhere or a multimillion-dollar project that utterly lacks funding and will result in a train line without riders.

None of this is true.

The Central Subway is the second phase of the T-Third Street route, a 5.1-mile light-rail line that has done much good by connecting downtown with the southeastern neighborhoods of The City. The entire project germinated from the Embarcadero Freeway teardown after the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake. The compromise for not rebuilding the freeway was to plan for this new transit line.

The Central Subway project will extend the T-Third Street line 1.7 miles through the South of Market neighborhood, with stops at Moscone Center and Union Square, and end in Chinatown. The project will tie together one of the fastest-growing sections of The City with one of the densest neighborhoods in the nation. The ridership projections for the project, which opponents say are too low to justify the \$1.6 billion cost, are for the small section of line itself. The opponents point to one number—35,000 riders in 2020.

But the true ridership number is for the entire T-Third Street line, which is projected to be about 65,000 by 2030.

It is true that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency is moving ahead with this project without full federal funding. The work has been going on for some time, such as the moving of utilities that are in the way of tunneling. In these days of tight federal funding, when the present Congress is in the hands of tea party ideologues who want to kill public works projects that aren't car-oriented, the only way to prove a project is worthy of federal funding is having it shovel ready—or in this case, bore-ready.

But since the SFMTA has done so much to prove it is fully invested in this project, we are confident that the subway line is going to be fully financed. The Federal Transit Administration is expected to provide the final \$942 million by the end of the month. This funding will be enough to complete the tunnel bore.

The SFMTA does not exactly have a proactive reputation. But in this case, it should be applauded for continuing to push ahead with a major construction project, even if the last bit of money is not quite yet secured. This money has been crawling through the pipeline for years.

The Central Subway line will be a major asset to San Francisco, and local and federal officials need to present a united front to finalize the funding as soon as possible.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAVAACK

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Transportation to research or implement a distance-based fee system, commonly referred to as Vehicle Miles Traveled, that would levy a fee on a vehicle user based on the distance traveled.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAVAACK. I rise today in support of my amendment, which would prohibit the utilization of funds by the Secretary of Transportation to research or implement a distance-based fee system, commonly referred to as vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, that would levy a fee on a surface transportation vehicle user based on the distance traveled.

Mr. Chair, it is no secret that our current highway trust fund system is going bankrupt. The Federal gas tax designed to support this fund finds itself increasingly unable to pay for better roads, bridges, and rail due to several factors:

People are driving less due to a weak economy and high gas prices;

The creation of more fuel-efficient cars allows people to fill up less frequently at the pump;

And let's not forget about how Congress has been raiding the gas tax proceeds for decades to fund alternative transportation activities that in no way help maintain and improve roads and bridges we drive, such as building bike paths and planting flowers.

There is an important need to come up with new, better ideas on how to appropriately fund our highway trust fund system. However, I am here to tell you today that the concept of using a vehicle miles traveled fee system is not one of those better ideas.

Requiring people to pay for the miles they travel each year is not acceptable on a number of levels:

A VMT tax would be expensive to implement because every car would need to be fitted with a device that both records the miles driven and transmits the information to a government database. This complicated system would cost millions of dollars to install these devices in new vehicles, and it would cost many millions more if older vehicles and motorcycles are expected to be retrofitted with these devices;

The cost required to administer this taxation is expensive and inefficient, especially compared to the Federal gas tax, which provides an inexpensive form of taxation that is collected directly from refineries and importers;

Further, the requirement of an electronic mileage-tracking device to be installed in all cars also poses a significant privacy concern and a severe threat to our private information should one of these systems be hacked or corrupted. The potential for privacy abuse is a hazard waiting to happen. Government databases have already been compromised in the past, and this government system would be no exception;

Finally, the VMT tax would impose a "regressive tax" that would hit constituents in rural districts like Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District, the district that I represent, harder than any others. My constituents often have to drive many miles more than urban counterparts to perform the same daily tasks, like going to work, grocery shopping, dropping the kids off at school, and making deliveries for their small businesses. My constituents are already struggling to make ends meet with the current gas prices. Penalizing them for nothing more than living in a rural area will put them over the edge.

In sum, the VMT tax would produce a strongly negative reaction from the public—and for good reason. Americans don't like paying for the gas tax, and they are sure going to be even more unhappy about having to deal with an administrative and privacy nightmare that VMT promises. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of my amendment, which would prevent

the Secretary of Transportation from using funds to research or implement this harmful fee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I would like to join with the gentleman here in support of this amendment. I would like to make a couple of points.

If you represent a rural district, this is an enormous issue. Oftentimes, on average, jobs will pay less in urban areas to begin with. On average, a lot of these folks have to drive long distances to work. We've got people in my district today that drive 50 and 60 miles one way to their job every day, and this would be an enormous hardship on these folks.

I would also add that the Secretary of Transportation and the administration, 2 years ago when we were trying to get a highway bill done, the administration took this off the table. They said, We're not going to do this. And so I don't see why the Secretary would need to do research or any kind of means of implementation if, in fact, they so strongly oppose this type of taxation.

So for several different reasons, I commend this gentleman on this amendment and rise in its support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. I oppose this amendment strongly, but not because I like a VMT, particularly, and not that I do not understand that in rural areas this can be very burdensome. However, we have to have additional revenue. The reason our infrastructure is in decline is simple: We're simply not raising enough revenue.

We haven't decided how to raise revenue to fund our infrastructure needs. Yet we have report after report from the American Society of Civil Engineers with an infrastructure report card that gives us a D, estimating that more than \$2 trillion in investment is needed in our system, a gap of at least \$27 billion each year, from the DOT's own most recent conditions and performance report. There is a \$27 billion per year gap just to maintain the current system of highways and bridges in a state of good repair.

□ 2050

The gas tax has not been raised since 1993. The total amount of revenue that was raised 10 years ago is only a couple of billion dollars lower than it is now 10–11 years later. We know that the vehicles that are being produced now, correctly, and we must do this, are more efficient than they were earlier and so gasoline tax doesn't bring in as much money. That's fine, but you still have to have the revenue to build a

transportation infrastructure program that is going to be good that will keep the economy of the country strong. Every good and every product of this country has to move along an efficient transportation system covering all of our modes of transportation and has to be kept up, in good repair.

And for the major population growth which continues at 10 percent every decade with all these major metropolitan areas going up and up and up in population, you have to have a lot of new infrastructure built and you have to maintain the old infrastructure in the older communities or everybody is going to be behind. Even the rural areas, even though many of them, and in the gentleman's poor part of the country, there are States where more than half, several States, at least 10 States that have more than half of all of their counties losing population. But to allow the infrastructure, the highway system to fall apart in those places, means you doom those areas to an economic future which is going to be very bleak, indeed.

So the amendment, it's unfortunate because we are probably going to have to use different kinds of money-raising mechanisms in different parts of the country. This one makes it not possible for the administration to even think about using the vehicle miles tax even in the urban, major urban areas of the country.

In any case, I oppose the amendment. I know quite well what the result of my opposition is going to be, but I think ultimately, we somehow have to gain the courage and the will to raise the revenue that is necessary in order to keep our economy strong.

The transportation system in its totality represents close to 25 percent of the whole economy in this country. You cannot have a viable, robust economy with the jobs that we need if we do not figure out how to do what's needed in all parts of the country. So I oppose the amendment.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. And I appreciate what the gentleman, my good friend from Massachusetts, is talking about. I think you clearly remember the testimony from Secretary LaHood before the subcommittee.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I yield to Chairman LATHAM.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman very much. I just want to talk about the subject that the gentleman from Massachusetts brought up.

The Secretary of Transportation came before the subcommittee. We were talking about the difficulty we

were having as far as trying to write an appropriation bill with no new authorization. The Secretary on several different occasions said he would not entertain and they would strongly oppose both an increase in the gas tax and vehicle miles driven, and I'm sure that the gentleman from Massachusetts remembers that testimony very clearly.

I would just suggest that maybe someone should talk to the administration about finding sources for funding because the Secretary has taken every possibility off of the table to fund a new highway bill. And now we're apparently looking at a reauthorization that's finding other unique ways of funding rather than user fees or gas tax or miles driven or registration fees, whatever, they have taken off the table. So I would suggest the gentleman from Massachusetts would maybe visit with Mr. LaHood at the Transportation Department.

Mr. OLVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. I would like to continue this conversation for another moment or two, and that will save me time rather than having to figure out how to get my own time, Mr. Chairman. Somewhere along the way, it will come back to me. But in the midst of the discussion, I'm not likely to come up with it very easily.

In any case, I recognize exactly what the chairman of the committee is saying. It will be interesting to see what the authorizers come up with. I hope you had some ideas as to what they are going to do because the position that I am taking of the need for the infrastructure development in this country, both state of good repair, just repairing it, keeping it going, and then the additional infrastructure that is needed because of growth of populations, that is there and we must solve the problem. And it's not just the executive's problem, it's not just our problem, it's a problem for all of us, and this takes one piece, one possible piece out of the mix that could be part of the mix, simply takes it off the table, and that I object to. As somebody that is not going to be here next year when you may have to come up with a solution, I object to that being taken off the table. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CRAVAACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Sir, I can give you my commitment that I believe in a robust transportation system within the United States. We need it for economy and commerce, we understand that. But definitely, the VMT is a toxic part of this puzzle that we just can't use. I look forward to finding other alternatives to be able to fund the robust transportation system that I believe the United States needs. I thank the

gentleman very much for his comments.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. I will be brief. I wish the gentleman from Minnesota great luck in solving this one. I am so happy for the people on that side of the aisle who must be just ecstatic—ecstatic—that they have a President who will take all of these things off the table. But what are you going to do when you have to have jobs and a robust economy in this largest economy in the world?

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. LATHAM. You will remember also, during the hearings with the Secretary, I asked that very question of the Secretary. You're taking gas tax, vehicle miles traveled off the table, let's find a way to do this.

He said: Well, we need to sit down at the table and discuss this.

I said: Mr. Secretary, you're at a table. I'll be glad to come around and sit with you, and we'll discuss it. You come up with some ideas. And he came up with zero ideas, if you'll remember that.

Mr. OLVER. Reclaiming my time, at my age, I can't remember what happened several days ago, and that is quite some time ago. But, you know, it will slowly come back. Eventually, it slowly comes back.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. CRAVAACK).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2100

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAVAACK

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in furtherance of the implementation of the European Union greenhouse gas emissions trading scheme for aviation activities established by European Union Directive 2008/101/EC.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan amendment.

This amendment is a simple one. It prohibits the use of taxpayer funds in furtherance of the implementation of the European Union's Emissions Trading Scheme.

Starting in January, the European Union began to unilaterally apply the

Emissions Trading Scheme, ETS, to civil aviation operators landing or departing from one of the EU member states.

Under the Emissions Trading Scheme, EU member states will require international carriers and operators to pay emission allowances—and in some cases penalties—for carbon emissions resulting from their operations. The EU's Emissions Trading Scheme will apply to the entire length of the flight, including those flights outside the European airspace.

For instance, for a flight leaving Los Angeles for London, taxes would be levied not only for the portion of the flight over the United Kingdom, but also for portions of the flight over the United States and international waters.

Despite serious legal issues and objections by a majority of the international community, including the United States, India, Russia, China, and the International Civil Aviation Organization, the EU is pressing ahead with its plans. Russia, China, and India are taking very clear actions in opposition of EU's emission scheme. China and India have directed their air carriers not to comply with the EU's ETS requirements. China has delayed Airbus orders, India is threatening in-kind retaliation, and Russia is threatening to deny airspace access to European air carriers.

The European Union's unilateral application of the Emissions Trading Scheme onto U.S. operators without the consent of the United States Government raises significant legal concerns under international law, including violations of the Chicago Convention and the U.S.-EU Air Transport Agreement.

The Emissions Trading Scheme will actually harm efforts to reduce global aviation emissions. By taking money away from the airline industry that would otherwise be invested in NextGen technologies and the purchase of new aircraft—two proven methods for improving environmental performance—the EU is siphoning scarce money to be used as each member state sees fit.

A better approach to address aviation's impact on global emissions is to work with the international civil aviation community through the U.N. International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO, to establish consensus-driven initiatives to reduce emissions. However, because the EU has made no effort to delay or retract the illegal Emissions Trading Scheme, this amendment is necessary to ensure that American taxpayer dollars will not be used to further the Europeans' unilateral and questionable scheme.

Last October, the House passed H.R. 2954, which directs the Secretary of Transportation to prohibit U.S. carriers from participating in the Europeans' illegal scheme. A companion bill has been introduced in the Senate. It is my hope that the Senate will move

quickly towards its passage. That legislation, along with this amendment to the Transportation appropriations for fiscal year 2013, will send a very strong message to our European friends that an illegal and unilateral action to address aviation emissions is not the proper course of action to deal with this issue. This must be a consensus-driven solution, not an international mandate.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the distinguished gentleman, the Chairman, for the time, and let me just rise in strong support of this amendment.

This, I think, is one of the most outrageous, offensive taxes that I've ever heard of. The idea of taxing U.S. travelers from any point in the United States just because they're traveling to a destination in Europe is simply outrageous. It's going to be devastating to U.S. carriers, and it's something that we have got to put a stop to.

Like the gentleman talked about the international community's strong opposition, I think on a bipartisan basis everyone is opposed to this. It is, again, a far overreach. It is something that is unnecessary. It is simply wrong.

I really appreciate the gentleman's work on this to have this amendment brought forward as at least a first step in stopping this very, very, I think, egregious new tax.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the European Union has implemented an emissions trading regimen as a means of reducing greenhouse gas emissions 20 percent below 1990 levels. They are not succeeding very much. They are putting in a fairly hard effort to do that, but the greenhouse gas emissions continue to go up. The CO₂ percentage in the atmosphere is now, in the year 2012, about 50 percent higher than it has been at any time in the last 500,000 years and going up, continuing to go up. But we're not going to settle climate change issues tonight.

I understand that this amendment will be adopted, but the effort is going to have to eventually go on to deal with our climate change.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to support this amendment which would simply prohibit the use of any of the funds provided in the bill from being used to further the implementation of the illegal European Union's Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS).

The EU ETS has been a source of great concern of the Aviation Subcommittee, this House, the Administration, and the aviation community. The U.S. is joined in its opposition to the EU ETS by countries around the world.

Under the ETS, EU Member States will require international air carriers to pay emissions allowances, and perhaps penalties, for carbon emissions. A major objection is that the Emissions Scheme will apply to the entire length of the flight—including flight outside the European airspace.

The EU has no jurisdiction over airspace outside its boundaries and no legal basis to impose this Scheme on our air carriers. The unilateral application of ETS to our carriers in this way without our consent is a violation of international law—including the Chicago Convention and the U.S.-EU Air Transport Agreement.

There are other more productive ways to address the issue of carbon emissions, and the U.S. stands ready to work with our world partners through the International Civil Aviation Organization to do so—that is how you resolve global aviation issues.

Last year, this House passed H.R. 2954 which would direct the Secretary of Transportation to prohibit U.S. carriers from participating in this illegal Scheme. The Senate Commerce Committee held a hearing recently on a companion bill that has been introduced in the Senate.

This amendment is in line with the actions that the House has taken previously and reiterates the message that we will not stand for this unilateral, illegal scheme to be perpetrated against our carriers.

I urge Members to take a stand against this power grab and support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. CRAVACK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the amounts made available by this Act may be used by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration to require the placement of line markers under section 195.410(a)(1) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, other than at public road crossings and railroad crossings.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, we've all heard about many regulations that come from this town that seem to be ridiculous; sometimes they're innocuous, sometimes they're even humorous. These are regulations oftentimes that don't help anybody at all. Sometimes, however, they harm real people's lives and their homes and their businesses.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, along a half-mile stretch of Remington Road in Chamblee, Georgia, Plantation and Colonial Pipelines, under a requirement from the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Administration, was forced to place 17 new hazard markers on the front lawns of homes—in a subdivision. That brought the total number of hazard markers to 47–47 within a half-mile

stretch, a half-mile stretch of road in a residential subdivision where there's no new construction and the pipeline has been there for decades. You talk about ridiculous.

The regulation states:

Markers must be located at each public road crossing, at each railroad crossing, and in sufficient number along the remainder of each buried line so that its location is accurately known.

Now, though this particular regulation hasn't changed for many years, its interpretation clearly has. So, last month, my office sent a letter to the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Administration for clarification, and in response they said:

While the regulations specify the minimum requirements for line markers, they do not specify a maximum number of line markers. A pipeline operator is allowed to exceed the minimum regulatory requirements.

Well, Mr. Chairman, they certainly have exceeded the minimum number of markers. Look at this front lawn here, five or six markers in the front lawn of a residential area. Now, clearly this is absurd. I'm certain there are other communities across this great country that are similarly affected by an overzealous regulator. This doesn't help a soul, but what it does is likely depress property values at a very challenging time for homeowners. So let's put some common sense back in government.

This amendment that I have offered today is designed to stop the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Administration from broadly interpreting these regulations in the future by ensuring that no funds from the bill shall be used to require the placement of line markers other than at public road crossings and railroad crossings.

Now, we have struggled to find the right avenue to address this issue, and hopefully we will be able to get the attention of these wonderful folks and bring some sense to all of this. And though not possible to have this amendment brought to conclusion on this legislation, I do know that the chairman is as interested as I am in ending the overbearing regulatory scheme that seems to have overtaken every single department in this town.

□ 2110

If the chairman would be desirous, I would be happy to yield to him for a comment.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Obviously, we all want pipeline safety. That is the number one issue, but what you're talking about here is truly beyond the pale as far as any kind of common sense. We've got to find a balance, like you've talked about. The overreach that we're seeing in so many areas of the Federal Government causes things like this that are just simply nonsensical.

I appreciate the gentleman for bringing the issue forward and would want to work with him in the future to find a resolution to your concerns.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the chairman, and I appreciate that.

Again, this is simply ridiculous. If that's your front lawn, Mr. Chairman, that's the last place that you want to see those signs in your neighborhood and in your residential area.

So I appreciate the opportunity to bring this amendment. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the international highway technology scanning program, a program within the international highway transportation outreach program under section 506 of title 23, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It prohibits taxpayer dollars from being used for the Department of Transportation's International Highway Technology Scanning Program. According to the Department of Transportation, this program enables the Department's officials to access innovative technologies and practices in other countries that could significantly improve our Nation's highways.

I, and most taxpayers, really don't have any problem with that. If someone else has a good idea, we can and we should learn from that. But most taxpayers were outraged when ABC News and Citizens Against Government Waste highlighted that this program was bankrolling globe-trotting junkets across the world.

One such trip featured a 17-day ordeal to Australia, Sweden, the Netherlands, and Great Britain to look at billboards, all the while, racking up taxpayer bills at five-star hotels and restaurants. Among the important research conducted by the team was a trip to Scotland to evaluate "road furniture along rural roads." And in the Netherlands they took a serious look at "examples of outdoor advertising."

When the Federal Government is up to its neck in debt, such expenditures truly are an abuse of the taxpayers. As a result, Citizens Against Government Waste was able to apply enough pressure to the agency to suspend the \$1.2 million annual program. We're not really sure what "suspend" means, if it's for a day, a week, or a month.

ABC News reported that upwards of \$12 million has been spent on the program since the year 2000. I see the suspension of the program by Transportation Secretary LaHood as a really

good start, but there is still no guarantee that such waste will not resume, as nothing in law would prevent the program from being resurrected in the future. This amendment, very simply, will ensure that the program will not come back to life during the fiscal year 2013.

Mr. Chairman, Washington is approaching another trillion-plus deficit. We simply cannot afford five-star junkets.

I urge support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I rise in support of this amendment.

I appreciate very much the gentleman from Florida bringing this issue to the attention of the House and, again, very strongly support his proposal to do away with this wasteful spending.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to a possible attempt for a Member to bring forward an amendment which would prohibit any funds in H.R. 5972 from being used towards the California High-Speed Rail Project.

As a member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and a cochair of the California High-Speed Rail Congressional Caucus, this project is a priority of my State and the voters who agreed to move our State into the 21st century and to be able to be competitive globally.

Our Nation's ability to move goods and people is essential to develop and maintain a strong economy, and this project is critical to meeting the State's growing transportation needs. In fact, traffic congestion in California is increasing by 10 percent each year, and it's estimated that the State's airports will reach capacity by 2030. As California's population continues to boom, we must invest in alternative systems that will remedy this constant congestion and will help to protect the health and environment of local communities.

Now, as a member of the Transportation Committee, I happened to have the opportunity to participate with Chairman MICA when we went to the Central Valley to talk about the possibility of moving forward on high-speed rail. And admittedly, there were some concerns that were brought forward, but there were far more supporters who wanted to see high-speed rail move forward than those who were opposed.

And again, I want to stress that the voters in California took it upon them-

selves to tax themselves as an independent State body, to tax themselves to move forward on high-speed rail. So who are we, or the Federal Government, to prohibit providing funds that might match to enable that project to move forward?

Also, given the inherent speed limitations in the Northeast corridor, it seems to me that it would be ill-advised to deny California—and this country, more importantly—the efficient transportation options that many of us so richly need, especially knowing that California is one of the most traveled areas in this country.

As a result, even the earliest investments would be helpful before this project is completed. Now is the time to make smart and long-sighted investments for alternatives to congested highways and, simultaneously, to create jobs.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us an opportunity to support American workers for today by putting America on the road to recovery while, more importantly, developing a world-class rail system that we could compete with our competitors like China. Proper funding for the California High-Speed Rail project is a necessity for the success of California and the success of the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH OF VIRGINIA

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any new grant under the livable communities program of the Department of Transportation or the sustainable communities program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development or to implement any transfer of funds for any such new grant.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to offer an amendment that would prohibit the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development from issuing any new livable or sustainable community grants. While the Appropriations Committee did not include any new funds for these grants, my amendment goes a step further to ensure that neither the Department of Transportation nor the Housing Secretary can attempt to transfer any of their Department's discretionary funding.

In 2009, under the direction of President Obama, EPA, Department of Transportation, and HUD began the Partnership for Sustainable Communities, a joint venture to provide millions of dollars to local communities to entice them to buy into the President's sustainable development agenda.

Over 2010 and 2011, DOT and HUD awarded approximately \$96 million in

grant funding for sustainable and livable community initiatives; however, these programs were never authorized by Congress. In fact, the Financial Services Committee, who has authority over HUD programs, said that the:

Sustainable Communities Initiative, which has yet to be authorized by the Committee, should not be funded at the expense of other critical affordable housing programs.

This opinion of the sustainable communities program by the Financial Services Committee, was bipartisan and unanimous.

Last year, thankfully, no new funding was provided for sustainable community grants, but the conference committee reminded the Secretary that these efforts were eligible activities under other programs, meaning funding for the sustainable community grants could have been obtained by shifting funding. This amendment would prevent that shifting.

I do not believe the Federal Government should be enticing our local and State governments with this money to get them to buy into the President's sustainable development agenda that cedes some local or State authority to Federal or international bureaucracies and governing boards.

□ 2120

I commend the Appropriations Committee for not giving any new funds to these unauthorized grants. This amendment makes it clear that these activities should not be continued at DOT or at HUD under any circumstances.

As Robert Frost wrote, "Good fences make good neighbors."

This amendment will put up a fence to prevent shifting funding to a program this Congress has not approved, and it sends a message that our various States and local communities should be in control of their housing, transportation and zoning policies.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I rise in strong support of this amendment.

Let me just say that this has been a subject of great discussion with the ranking member and me over time. I hope the people of the House understand and the American people understand what an outright waste of money these projects have oftentimes become.

Everybody here is talking about our needing more money for infrastructure, transportation; let's get the trust fund built up; we're trying to find new ways of funding. I hope everyone understands that, 2 years ago, before we got control of this committee, they took \$150 million out of the highway trust fund to pay for sustainability projects and grants.

That's rather interesting.

When it's an unauthorized program, no one even has a definition of what a "sustainable community" is. There is

no definition of where this money could go. This is \$150 million, and people talk about all their projects at home—of their highways in disrepair, of the bridges falling down—and we're spending \$150 million out of that trust fund for things that aren't even defined and that are not authorized.

Mr. Chairman, it is outrageous.

I just spoke with the Secretary of HUD a few weeks ago on this issue because I have zeroed it out in this bill. There is no money for sustainable communities, whatever that is. Do you know the example the Secretary gave me of a good project? It would be to take millions of dollars from the Federal Government and give it to the area in North Dakota where they're having the expansion of the oil boom.

The State of North Dakota has billions of dollars in surplus. It has more money than it knows what to do with. Yet the Secretary says we should take sustainable community dollars from the Federal Government, of which we're borrowing 40 cents on the dollar from China, and give it to North Dakota to find out where it should put up its buildings in the oil boom area. I'm sorry, but I think they can afford to do that themselves.

So I would very strongly support the gentleman's amendment. Again, this is money that is coming out of the trust fund. Everybody here talks about roads in disrepair, bridges falling down, all that we need to do in the way of help for infrastructure, for jobs—and we're giving it to places like North Dakota. I'm sorry, but this is a waste of money, ill-defined, unauthorized. I very strongly support the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Again, I understand my very limited position here on this one, but I do rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am a strong supporter of the Sustainable Communities Program, and I am disappointed that there is no funding in this bill for sustainable communities. I have heard complaints that the Sustainable Communities Program isn't authorized. Well, neither is the CDBG program authorized, yet we include funding for that program in the bill and have for many years. It has not been individually authorized in quite some period of time.

The program actually has some good purposes. It integrates Federal, State and local investment activity in housing, land use, economic and workforce development, and transportation. At a time when we're under budget constraints, it's fairly important, if not critical, that the support for regional and local planning is available to help localities invest limited resources strategically in order to achieve the greatest short- and long-term benefits for citizens.

In the first 2 years, which is the 2 years that the program has been used—and it is a pilot program, basically, a demonstration program—it has been used in both urban and rural areas and in areas that are a little more than a city or a metropolitan area or that are a small group of counties up to a broader group that might cross State lines, where there are interests across those State lines and where the people have wanted to do it.

It was always one purely of applications from groups of people at the local level as well as from organizations at the local and regional levels that would put forward proposals to do that kind of integration and joint planning with the Federal Government, the State governments, and the local governments as to how they wanted to see their areas grow.

So I think it is an activity that we ought to have some opportunity for, but I know that that's not going to happen tonight. I simply regret that that is the way things are. I do oppose the amendment, but know that it will be adopted.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLORES. I rise to offer an amendment which addresses another misguided and restrictive Federal regulation.

Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act prevents Federal agencies from entering into contracts for the procurement of fuels unless their life cycles of greenhouse gas emissions are less than or equal to emissions from an equivalent conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum sources. In summary, my amendment would stop the government from enforcing this ban on all Federal agencies funded by the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill.

The initial purpose of section 526 was to stop the Defense Department's plans to buy and develop coal-based and/or coal-to-liquids jet fuel. This restriction was based on the opinion of some environmentalists that coal-based jet fuel might produce more greenhouse gas emissions than traditional petroleum-derived fuels.

Unfortunately, the ban on the fuel choices of section 526 has been expanded to include all Federal agencies,

not just the Defense Department. This is why I am offering this amendment to the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill.

Federal agencies should not be burdened with wasting their time in studying fuel restrictions when there is a simple fix. That fix is to not restrict our fuel choices based on extreme environmental views, bad policies and misguided regulations like those in section 526. Placing limits on Federal agencies' fuel choices is an unacceptable precedent to set in regard to America's energy independence and our national security.

Mr. Chairman, section 526 restrictions make our Nation more dependent on Middle Eastern oil. Stopping the impact of section 526 will help us to promote American energy, to improve the American economy, and to create American jobs. In addition, we must ensure that our military has adequate fuel resources so that it can rely on domestic and more stable sources of fuel.

With the increasing competition for energy and fuel resources and with the continued volatility and instability in the Middle East, it is now more important than ever for our country to become more energy independent and to develop and produce all of our domestic energy resources.

□ 2130

Mr. Chairman, in some circles there is a misconception that my amendment somehow prevents the Federal Government and our military from being able to procure and use alternative fuels such as biofuels. Mr. Chairman, this viewpoint is categorically false. All my amendment does is allow the Federal purchasers of fuels, particularly our military, to be able to acquire the fuels that best and most efficiently meet their needs.

I offered a similar amendment to the CJS appropriations bill, and it passed with bipartisan support. My identical amendments to the three other FY13 appropriations bills also passed by voice vote. My friend, Mr. CONAWAY, also had language added to the Defense authorization bill to exempt the Defense Department from this burdensome regulation.

Let's summarize the problems with section 526. Number one, it increases our reliance on Middle Eastern oil. Number two, it hurts our military readiness, our national security, and our energy security. Number three, it also prevents the potential increased uses of some sources of safe, clean, and efficient American oil and gas. Number four, it hurts American jobs and the American economy. And five, last but not least, it costs our taxpayers more of their hard-earned dollars.

My amendment fixes these problems, and I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this commonsense amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman, and I rise in support of this amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Secretary of Transportation to authorize a person—

(1) to operate an unmanned aircraft system in the national airspace system for the purpose, in whole or in part, of using the unmanned aircraft system as a weapon or to deliver a weapon against a person or property; or

(2) to manufacture, sell, or distribute an unmanned aircraft system, or a component thereof, for use in the national airspace system as a weapon or to deliver a weapon against a person or property.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of discussion about the use of unmanned aircraft, commonly referred to as drones, in United States airspace, and rightfully so.

Beginning with the FAA reauthorization bill which passed this House earlier in the year, the expansion of the use of unmanned aerial vehicles in the continental United States was expanded. Arguably, this was a useful expansion because we have vast areas of our border which are difficult to monitor. Sometimes there are search and rescue occurrences that happen in rough terrain where an unmanned aerial vehicle may be indispensable. But since that time, there has been a growing body of people who have been concerned about the effect of allowing these unmanned aerial vehicles the ability to surveil citizens. There has also been talk about the EPA using it to monitor herd size and the grazing habits of farmers. These are questions that are going to need to be answered. But in recent weeks, I have become aware of some discussion that in certain police jurisdictions they were talking about an army of unmanned aerial vehicles to assist in law enforcement.

Maybe that's something that's worthwhile to consider, but I can't help but feel that a step taken that far is something that this body should consider. While I appreciate the subcommittee chairman's concern about legislating on an appropriations bill,

we're in new territory. We're in uncharted territory, and this amendment is a first-aid maneuver. It is to place a bandage, if you will, on a growing problem to see if we can't stop and have the discussion before the Secretary spends money authorizing the use of armed unmanned aerial vehicles.

No one disputes in war zones and in battle space the use of an unmanned aerial vehicle. An armed unmanned aerial vehicle is incredibly useful. No one argues the utility of these unmanned aircraft in that situation. All I would say is that before we allow that to be occurring in our backyards, on our highways and byways, we need to consider the effects of that. Are we, in fact, ensuring the constitutional rights of the people who not just are being surveilled, but who may be being controlled by the armaments that would be present in these weaponized vehicles?

My amendment would prevent the Secretary of Transportation, the head of the FAA, from approving any application to use an unmanned aircraft in the United States airspace for the purpose of arming or weaponizing that aircraft. It does not affect the surveillance question. So surveillance drone applications certainly, if they are authorized, may go forward. Nor does it affect weaponized drones that are operating outside the United States airspace.

The amendment that I offer today is preemptive. As to my knowledge, no actual applications have been filed with the FAA to use armed drones in U.S. airspace. But I believe it is necessary, as there has been some discussion in the public media about the ability to arm unmanned aerial vehicles. I personally believe this is a road down which we should not travel. It is the old argument of sacrificing safety for security, and ultimately achieving neither objective.

I think this is an amendment that would be well advised by this body to consider this evening. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it if it is allowed to stand, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I continue on my reservation, and I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I want to thank the gentleman. Unfortunately, for consistency, we're going to have to pursue the point of order.

This issue has been brought to my attention. I've expressed concerns myself as to how information is used. Certainly, we want to make sure that we're very careful as far as privacy issues in this country, the way that these things may be used for purposes that no one quite understands or intended to have happen.

While I share your concerns, for consistency reasons here, I must insist on my point of order.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking member.

Mr. OLVER. I will be very brief.

I serve on the Homeland Security Subcommittee for Appropriations, and I don't think that the Homeland Security authorizers have done anything along these lines, and that's where it really ought to be dealt with, I would think.

So I will agree with what you're doing.

Mr. BURGESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I would be more than happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Here is the problem.

It was a simple line in the FAA reauthorization bill. We were all happy when we reauthorized the FAA. It hadn't been done in some 26 attempts—"the dog ate my homework," we got IOUs and extensions on the FAA. But then here was this very simple language allowing for the expansion of unmanned aerial vehicles in the national airspace. None of us really thought that was much of a problem, but our constituents are bringing it back to us. They are concerned about privacy, and they're concerned about Federal agencies surveilling normal activities of commerce in which people may be engaged. But then we have gone one step further.

If these drones are weaponized, you can—if you've been surveilled unfairly, you can go to court and perhaps seek a remedy. But if a bullet is fired from one of these platforms, you don't have any remedy if you're the recipient of that bullet.

All I'm asking is that we take all due care and caution, and exercise all due care and caution. We are entering a Brave New World here, and it is incumbent upon every one of us to be certain we do so with all care and caution before we proceed.

I appreciate the gentleman allowing me to express my thoughts on this amendment. I wish it could stand. I wish we could vote on it this evening. I understand for consistency why he is insisting on his point of order. But we're going to have to revisit this.

H.R. 5950 is standalone legislation that would prohibit this activity. I encourage Members of Congress to look into cosponsoring that.

□ 2140

Mr. LATHAM. Reclaiming my time, let me just say, in the authorization of the FAA, their specific role was air traffic concerns that they may have safety concerns, collisions with other aircraft. I agree with the gentleman, it should probably be a Homeland Security issue. I also serve on the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations. It has not been brought up in that.

I do share your concerns. But unfortunately, I must insist on my point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amend-

ment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law." The amendment imposes additional duties and requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination regarding the end use of certain aircraft systems and their components. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to establish, issue, implement, administer, or enforce any prohibition or restriction on the establishment or effectiveness of any occupancy preference for veterans in supportive housing for the elderly that (1) is provided assistance by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and (2)(A) is or would be located on property of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or (B) is subject to an enhanced use lease with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, we must ensure that the men and women who bravely served our country have access to affordable housing. My amendment seeks to make sure that conflicting government regulations do not pose an impediment to achieving this important goal.

Currently, the VA requires a veteran's preference for housing built on VA property. However, HUD requires that HUD-assisted projects contain no preferences. These conflicting rules and regulations make it nearly impossible to help low-income senior veterans access affordable housing on VA property with HUD assistance.

My amendment prohibits HUD from using funds to enforce the restriction against a veteran's preference for housing projects built on a VA campus or that use a VA-enhanced use lease. The language is identical to an amendment that I authored which the House unanimously approved twice and was included in H.R. 3288, the Fiscal Year 2010 Consolidated Appropriations Act.

As a result, in my southwest Ohio community, St. Mary Development Corporation is currently building housing for senior veterans on the campus

of the Dayton VA, which will help provide veterans close access to the services they need.

Mr. Chairman, this project can be a model in that it can be used across the country to help homeless veterans, provide low-income housing for veterans, and respond to the needs of seniors in the community. I urge all my colleagues to support this important amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I would just like to lend my support for this amendment. It's something where clarification needs to be done, and the rules need to work for veterans for these processes. This has been one of the hang-ups for veterans being able to get into assisted living or houses. And any backlog that there has been has been basically a bureaucratic backlog, rather than a funding issue in the past. So it's a good amendment, and I would urge its passage.

Mr. OLVER. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Very briefly, I would just like to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio for being watchful of this sort of thing. This is the sort of thing that, it seems to me, ought to be really very logical. And I have supported it in the past, as he has already referenced. So I'm happy to see that it's working in your community.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

Mr. GARRETT. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used to promulgate, issue, establish, implement, administer, finalize, or enforce the proposed rule issued by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and published in the Federal Register on September 16, 2011 (76 F.R. 70921; relating to Implementation of the Fair Housing Act's Discriminatory Effects Standard).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that attempts to restore some sanity, fairness, and certainty to mortgage and insurance companies. My amendment would undo harmful economic actions taken by the administration that will, if carried out, continue to weaken credit availability and job creation.

You see, earlier this year, the Department of Housing and Urban Development proposed a rule to establish

regulatory standards regarding the use of the legal theory known as “disparate impact.” Disparate impact liability allows for plaintiffs and government agencies to bring suit charging discriminatory practices based solely on statistics. If statistics indicate, for instance, that disparity exists between the number of loans made in a specific area to a certain preferred minority class versus the number of preferred minorities that live in that area, a lender could be charged with discriminatory practices, even if there was no intent whatsoever.

Now, we all agree that discrimination is terrible and that when there is intent, we must prosecute to the fullest extent of the law. But under the example I laid out, the lender could even have specific anti-discriminatory practices in his company in place, but still be found liable under this legal theory. You see, accurate risk identification and classification is essential to the lending and insurance business, but the HUD rule ignores that.

Risk-based lending and insurance underwriting and pricing that unintentionally results in a statistically disparate outcome, that is not discrimination.

The proposed HUD rule would create a presumption of discriminatory disparate impact that could basically undermine the basic purposes of risk-based pricing, which ensures persons with different risk characteristics have to make payments commensurate with the risk they pose. So protected-class characteristics, including race, are actually prohibited from consideration in this assessment. State law already prohibits insurers from recording race, for example. But this HUD rule requiring race consideration would be impossible, then, under State law.

Looking specifically at homeowners insurance, commonly considered factors—including applicant’s claim history, construction materials, the presence or absence of a security system, and the distance from a firehouse—could be barred if they were found to result in creating a statistical disparity for a class defined by race, ethnicity, or gender.

You see, all 50 States have anti-discrimination provisions in their housing insurance regulations already, and there is no claim that these regulations have been insufficient. So the process that HUD proposes for the disparate impact rule is, therefore, unworkable and economically impractical.

The process HUD proposes for defending against a charge of unlawful discrimination based upon disparate impact would then require a defendant to prove a ridiculously high standard, that the challenged practice is necessary to its very survival, and that its business would basically collapse if it didn’t do it.

You see, the process HUD proposes would find the defendant company liable if a court could find another prac-

tice that is simply less discriminatory, not, instead, a reasonable, economical, practical, workable, state-authorized, or known practice. Simply, all they have to come up with is another practice.

□ 2150

Extending disparate impact analysis to facially-neutral practices exceeds HUD’s authority under the FHA and it is contrary to law. Extending disparate impact analysis to facially-neutral practices therefore is arbitrary and it is capricious. Therefore, the application of this HUD rule on the insurance industry should be precluded, and it should preclude it also because of McCarran-Ferguson. Recognizing disparate impact analysis under the FHA exceeds HUD’s authority under the FHA and therefore is contrary to law.

The Supreme Court recently agreed to hear a challenge on this. I think it was just last year. Unfortunately, you may know that that case was withdrawn. Why? Because of pressure from this administration. The administration rightly, I believe, was concerned that the Court would strike down the whole theory as being unconstitutional.

Now recently a new case had been submitted to the Supreme Court for consideration on the very same issue. I hope the Court takes that case up soon. The Justice Department knows it has a weak case, and I do not believe that this administration should try to front-run the Supreme Court and attempt to push through this failed legal theory.

My amendment would prohibit HUD from finalizing this rule that harms credit availability and job creation. It is supported by the Mortgage Bankers Association, the National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, along with a couple other institutions as well—the American Insurance Association and the Property Casualty Insurance Association of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLIVER. The issue here seems to be—and I don’t know this very well. The issue seems to be that there have been cases where discrimination has occurred, and it has been adjudicated as having occurred when there was no intent to do so in the first place.

In a recent HUD action, this impact was used to protect the rights of women who were evicted because they were victims of domestic violence. Well, there was no intent to discriminate against the victims of the domestic violence, but that’s what it was that has been adjudicated in this particular case.

Cases of this sort have been brought before 11, I think, of the 13 appeals courts at this point, and the rule which HUD has put forward, the so-called dis-

parate impact rule, comes out of their understanding of the cases before the appeals courts where discrimination was determined legally in the appeals courts to have occurred.

So the idea that the gentleman is putting forward of prohibiting the finalization of the disparate impact rule which rises out of these cases before the appeals court seems to me to be exactly the opposite thing that should be done. Unless you get to a point where the appeals court gets to a higher court, which I guess the higher court is the Supreme Court of the United States, and they overturn the positions that have been taken by these several appeals courts in rather similar cases, then HUD is doing exactly what they need to do.

So I must rise in opposition to this. All of the people in the authorizing side of this are saying—at least on my side of the authorization process, which means the ranking member of the authorizing committee here—is opposed to this amendment. Mr. FRANK, the ranking member of the Housing Subcommittee, also opposes, I think, for roughly the reason that I have articulated here. So the gentleman is trying to stop the process.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. And that’s just my point. I’m not trying to stop any process. What I’m trying to do is prevent this administration from doing an end-run on the process.

You set up the record almost completely straight. There were court cases on this. It was going to the Supreme Court. It was about to go to the Supreme Court and be heard, and then this administration put pressure on the city that was involved in it to stop it, and they withdrew the case. We would have had the decision by the Supreme Court in that matter, but the administration basically said no, because they wanted to go ahead with their actions here without interference of the Supreme Court.

Fortunately, though, there is now another case that’s been filed, and it’s from my home State of New Jersey. This will give us all exactly what we need, just what you were saying: lower court, and now it’s being appealed up to the Supreme Court.

Mr. OLIVER. Reclaiming my time, we have no idea whether the Supreme Court will take this case. In the meantime, until such time it is taken and they do it, and we can’t assume that, then the actions of HUD are proper in reaching a disparate impact rule that adheres to the findings in the several appeals courts. My staff tells me it is 11 of the appeals courts have reached similar decisions which are adhered to by the HUD impact rule proposed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Let me just stand up in support of the amendment. I think it's a good amendment. Insurance companies are not able to determine risk, and that oftentimes means much greater cost.

I think it's a good amendment going forward, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASSIDY

Mr. CASSIDY. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Secretary of Transportation to make any transfer under the last proviso under the heading "Department of Transportation—Office of the Secretary—Payments to Air Carriers".

Mr. CASSIDY. As that reading suggests, this amendment addresses accountability for the Essential Air Service.

Earlier this year, the House and Senate agreed upon an FAA authorization after a fairly contentious debate. Chief among the issues which were resolved was a dispute over the Essential Air Service program, which provides Federal subsidies for airlines which provide flights to rural or otherwise remote airports.

While the work done by Chairman MICA and his colleagues adds several important reforms to the EAS program, a number of issues have since surfaced. Tonight, I'm offering an amendment to hopefully resolve one of those.

As currently written, the T-HUD bill funds the Essential Air Service program through a \$114 million appropriation from the Airway Trust Fund and via what are called overflight fees, which are charged by the FAA to foreign aircraft using American airspace and navigation assets. In 2011, as a result of an annual increase of 17 percent to the overflight fee, the Department of Transportation estimated that the fee would bring in around \$69 million in revenue for fiscal year 2013, which, when paired with the annual appropriation from the Airway Trust Fund, would provide all the money needed to operate the EAS program.

□ 2200

DOT, however, was wrong about their original \$69 million projection. According to the President's budget and report language in this bill, the projected revenues from the overflight fees are actually \$100 million. That means that when you combine \$114 million appropriated in this bill plus the \$100 million in revenues from the overflight fees, the EAS program has \$214 million.

Now, you could ask, Is this adequate to fund the program? It certainly

should be. In fiscal year 2011, before the plan began to start scaling back the program, expenditures were around \$195 million. Put differently, as we've scaled back the program, we have actually increased funding by about \$19 million. Only in Washington would that be a scale. I shouldn't laugh.

But that's not the only source of funding that the bill provides. It also allows the Secretary of Transportation, at his discretion, to provide more funds in case the \$214 million in revenue does not cover all obligations. How is this possible? Through the authorizing language tacked onto the end of the EAS section at the bottom of page 7:

Provided further: That if the funds under this heading are insufficient to meet the costs of the essential air service program in the current fiscal year, the Secretary shall transfer such sums as may be necessary to carry out the essential air service program from any available amounts appropriated to or directly administered by the Office of the Secretary for such fiscal year.

Let me repeat: "such sums as may be necessary to carry out the essential air service program."

In other words, this is a blank check for the Secretary to redirect to EAS if they overrun their \$214 million allowance.

I have introduced this amendment to correct this issue and enforce the fiscal discipline that I think even the strongest proponents of the program hope to see. The amendment preserves the EAS program, but forces it to live within its mean and prioritize spending to where it is most necessary and cost effective.

My amendment nullifies the Secretary's authorization language from the bill and allows the FAA to spend only the money appropriated to it through both the Airways Trust Fund and the overflight fees.

Some may oppose this and point out that the section in question does not deal with any new spending or funding, only with allowing the Secretary to direct unobligated balances. However, this perpetuates the "use it or lose it" mentality in the Federal Government. It should be a principle that agencies ask for and receive only the funds they absolutely need for their programs and that any unnecessary overpaid funds be returned unspent to the taxpayers. Empowering the Secretary to use unspent money on more EAS flights is a step in the wrong direction.

Under the bill as written, there will be no impetus for FAA to prioritize funds or substantially cut back on unnecessary flights if too much is spent. Any gaps in funding can simply be filled in by the Secretary at his discretion without congressional approval.

I voted last night for the McClintock amendment to phase out the EAS program, but I respect the decision of the House and the Members who voted to keep it in place. The program is going to stay; my amendment doesn't change that. However, just because someone voted not to eliminate the program does not mean they cannot vote to im-

pose reasonable rules and limits. Simply put, spending \$214 million for EAS is enough. Please keep it from going any higher and preserve the congressional power of the purse.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. We are pleased to accept the amendment.

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana for his solution, but I have to admit that I cannot identify what the problem is that this solution solves.

This language that you are excluding has been in the legislation for years, before I think I was—the earliest time I was in the ranking membership of the Transportation Subcommittee, and that of course was several years before I chaired the Transportation Subcommittee. I think it has been in the language all that time and never come up. So there has been no problem that we solved where it has never been used. That flexibility has never been used to transfer money from some place in order to put money into the EAS program.

So, yes, you have a solution, but I don't know what the problem is.

Mr. CASSIDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. It may be that in practice it has not resulted in a problem. It certainly is a loophole that evades the congressional power of the purse.

Now, if in some way we could look into the future and know it was never going to be an issue, you're right, it would not be an issue. On the other hand, without that kind of prescience, it seems to be the better part of valor to reclaim our power.

Mr. OLVER. In any case, I don't object to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to design, construct, or operate a fixed guideway project located in Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, this Nation cannot continue spending money it doesn't have. It is imperative that Congress end the borrow-and-spend mentality that created our staggering national debt and that we put our Nation on a sustainable path to a balanced budget. Now, more than ever, we need to be pragmatic in our approach to transportation, ensuring that every dollar spent represents a long-term investment that will improve the flow of commerce and create American jobs.

My amendment this evening is about priorities. The city of Cincinnati has been in the planning process of constructing a streetcar for years now. The primary funding for this project came in the form of an urban circulator grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation in the amount of \$25 million. Earlier this year, city of Cincinnati officials came to my office looking for even more funds for the Cincinnati streetcar project. The total cost is expected to be well over \$120 million for a 4-mile loop connecting only two Cincinnati neighborhoods with little-to-no positive impact on traffic congestion, freight, or our aging infrastructure. Far from a necessity, the Cincinnati streetcar is a luxury project that our Nation and our region simply cannot afford.

Imprudent and irresponsible spending of taxpayer dollars on discretionary projects like this must stop. For too long, taxpayers have been footing the bill for frivolous projects that reap little to no benefit. Much like the "bridge to nowhere," this "streetcar to nowhere" is yet another instance of wasteful government spending.

My amendment simply says, no more—no more funding for this streetcar in my own district. Unlike the Cincinnati streetcar, however, there are a number of other infrastructure projects that are of high priority and far more worthy of Federal infrastructure investment. In particular, there are two ready-to-begin projects that would have a direct impact on Cincinnati's economy and create permanent jobs, and those are replacing the Brent Spence Bridge and completing the I-71 Martin Luther King interchange.

The Brent Spence Bridge carries two major interstate highways that connect Ohio and Kentucky and serves as a major thoroughfare not just for Cincinnati, but for the entire Midwest region, and in fact the Nation at large. Furthermore, this bridge rests on one of the busiest freight routes in North America and is estimated to carry 4 percent of the Nation's gross domestic product annually.

The Federal Highway Administration has declared the Brent Spence Bridge functionally obsolete, indicating that the current state of the bridge does not meet today's standards. Currently, this bridge carries 170,000 vehicles on average per day, which is more than double the 80,000 it was designed to carry. Replacing the bridge would save an estimated \$748 million in congestion costs

annually, savings that would grow in real dollars to \$1.3 billion annually by 2030.

The other worthy project I mentioned, the Martin Luther King interchange plan, has long been on the minds of businesses and citizens in our region, so much so that stakeholders have their own money in this plan. Unlike the streetcar to nowhere, the completion of this much-needed project would have a direct impact on one of Cincinnati's most important economic hubs. The Martin Luther King interchange would free up traffic congestion around the University of Cincinnati, Children's Hospital, and the uptown region of Cincinnati.

□ 2210

This proposed interchange would directly impact 60,000 people who work in the area and allow far greater highway access, generating an additional 2,000-plus permanent jobs.

We need to focus our limited resources on projects that are practical, impactful, and that will deliver results. Those of us in Congress must make responsible choices and invest in projects on their merits and nothing else. We owe it to the American people to invest only in those projects that will produce real results, keep us competitive, and, most importantly, create American jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member rise in opposition to the amendment?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to share my concerns over the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's recent regulatory guidance on the "oilfield exception" to the agency's "Hours of Service" requirements for drivers.

Under the Administration's regulations, specially trained drivers of specially constructed vehicles used to service oil wells do not have to count waiting time at the well site toward their hours of service limit. The new regulatory guidance, however, provides that drivers of support vehicles, such as those used to transport materials and supplies, used directly in the delivery of oil and gas services do not qualify for that same exception. The administration issued this guidance without prior comment, making it effective immediately and requesting comments after the fact.

Support drivers generally work under the exact same conditions as drivers of specially constructed vehicles, including the same periods of idleness while their vehicles are in use at the well site. Many drivers operate specially constructed vehicles one day and other support vehicles the next.

The new guidance creates a different standard for these exact same drivers. When operating a support vehicle, the driver's waiting time counts toward his or her hours of service limit, but when operating a specially constructed vehicle, that idle time does not count.

This double standard will create needless confusion among drivers and dispatchers who will now need to juggle competing rules for drivers depending on the vehicles they're driving on a particular day. In addition, while not applying the waiting time exception to drivers of support vehicles means that it will require more trucks and drivers to be dispatched while others are out of service, increasing truck traffic, especially on rural roads.

Many of our rural roads, particularly in the most active producing areas such as the Marcellus and the Bakken shale, are already struggling under the burden of heavy truck traffic. Adding more heavy vehicles to the roads will not enhance safety no matter how rested the drivers might otherwise be.

When I dealt with this issue with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration in 2006, I thought we had reached an understanding of the industry's oilfield equipment vehicle operations and safety protocols. Unfortunately, the agency's new interpretation undoes this careful compromise.

It is important for the administration to document why it is pursuing this new interpretation and provide that data—if it actually has any—that it is using to support this change. I believe that, at a minimum, the agency should not put this revised guidance into effect until after the public has had a chance to comment and for the agency to consider those comments. The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration should not implement the new administrative interpretation until it provides adequate and complete justification for the changes that it's seeking to make.

Mr. Chairman, I call this regulatory overreach to the attention of the requisite committee so that, while they're doing their oversight of this agency, they can review this interpretation and perhaps add their influence to undoing this overreach.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the salary of any officer or employee of the Federal Highway Administration to implement, administer, or enforce the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.) or Executive Order No. 13186 of January 10, 2001, with respect to, or to determine any action of the Administration to have a significant impact under section 102(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(C))

based on the effect of such action on, the cliff swallow or barn swallow (as listed in section 10.13(c)(1) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, this may seem like a very simple, straightforward amendment, but we do have an issue in construction.

In the summer all across America, the cliff swallow and the barn swallow, which is a very common migratory bird—this is not an endangered species; it's not even a threatened species; it is a common migratory bird in almost every State in America—they travel back and forth, move around, and they love to nest around man-made objects.

The law states now, currently, that you can't touch a bridge or any kind of construction if that barn swallow or cliff swallow is present there. So during the prime construction time, from early June through September, you can't do construction on many bridges, or construction companies have to hire people to go out and stand around the construction site to wave off the birds to keep them from nesting there to be able to fight this off during the earliest part of the season. There are numerous cases of this.

In my own State of Oklahoma, let me just give you one example of that.

In Ellis County, State Highway 46, they were painting a bridge. Just painting it; no construction, no anything else. The total project was estimated to cost \$185,000. Because in the process of going out to check and verify they found a barn swallow there, they had to halt that until after September to come back and paint it. It increased the price of the project \$27,000 to set up, realize it's there, tear down, come back, and do it all over again—a 15 percent increase for a painting job.

Now, I say this to say this is not an issue that is going to shape the future of America, but this is one of those issues that does increase the cost of construction over a bird that is not endangered, that is not threatened, that is incredibly common.

Should we honor wildlife? Absolutely. But this dramatically drives up the cost and decreases the amount of construction that we can do in America during prime construction season. I would just suggest that we take just these two species and set them out just for transportation purposes here.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I understand the gentleman's concern, and I'm prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. LANKFORD. With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. This is a peculiar amendment, it seems to me.

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act is administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior, so there's no enforcement power in the Department of Transportation. Are there agreements by which the DOT and the Department of the Interior are bound?

Mr. LANKFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes. Actually, in 2001, the President did Executive Order 13586. That executive order extended that out to all agencies dealing with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. So it does extend this out to the Department of Transportation as well, as well as all their agencies.

Now, if they're going to prosecute, obviously it's going to be the Department of Justice, and the rules are going to be promulgated out of Fish and Wildlife, but all agencies are affected by it based on the executive order from 2001. So we're just trying to take this for transportation only because it is such an issue for much of the transportation across the entire country.

Mr. OLVER. And this was an executive order promulgated by President Clinton or by President Bush?

Mr. LANKFORD. By President Clinton at the very end, in early January of 2001—January 10, actually.

Mr. OLVER. Well, I don't know how this amendment is going to solve the problem that you have exactly, but the chairman has agreed to adopt it. So I will state an objection because I really don't understand how this is going to solve your problem, but I will not go beyond that.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2220

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is agreed to.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, you have hit the gavel.

I would like to ask unanimous consent to call for a recorded vote on that.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts was on his feet. The request is timely and does not require unanimous consent.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for high-speed rail in the State of California or for the California High-Speed Rail Authority.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It just basically says, at the end of this bill none of the funds may be used for high-speed rail in California.

California has a project that was supposed to cost \$33 billion. The voters in California voted for bonds of \$9.9 billion. The Federal Government was supposed to come up with \$10 billion, and a private company was supposed to come up with \$10 billion. The problem is there is no private investor for the \$10 billion; the Federal Government is broke with \$16 trillion worth of debt and can't come up with \$10 billion; and the State of California can no longer float the bond because their credit rating is so bad.

To compound the matter, it's no longer a \$33 million project. It ballooned to \$68 billion, then on up to \$98 billion. And when talking to Secretary LaHood, he said there's no end in sight, that this is a project that could continue to change as we move forward. In fact, that's what we're actually seeing in California, an initiative that bounces back and forth, \$10 billion here or \$10 billion there.

So again, this amendment is very simple. It just says none of these funds can be used for high-speed rail.

In California we've got highways that are falling apart, bridges that are falling apart. We need to make sure that our gas tax dollars get used for their intended purpose of actually improving our roads and highways.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, there are no funds made available in this Act for high-speed rail. None. And so, since this is a 1-year bill, I don't think this amendment does very much.

The gentleman from California has a problem with a process that has been going on now for at least a decade in the development of a high-speed rail process program, and the people of California have spoken on this by referendum. They have passed the bond bill by referendum. I think bond bills usually take an extraordinary vote, two-thirds vote or something like that. Am I correct?

Would the gentleman from California confirm that it was a two-thirds vote by which the referendum was passed?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENHAM. Sir, you are correct. And now the voters are two-thirds against the bill by several different polls.

Mr. OLVER. Well, that can be established if they actually have a referendum that repeals what they have done. But there has been—as we know, California has received about \$4 billion of moneys from the Federal Government from earlier funds in earlier bills which have already been obligated or are about to be obligated. And actions on this bill would not have anything to do with the obligation of those funds, would not be in effect at any time that could affect the obligation of those funds because they have to be obligated before the end of this fiscal year, where this bill is certainly not going to be in place in before the end of the fiscal year. But there are processes also going on. Unfortunately, we have, at the moment, no one here who is really knowledgeable precisely about what it is that's going on in California.

But let me just comment here that the proposal for the starting use of these funds has been controversial. There are people who say, well, why are we building this in the Central Valley of California? Because the first intended construction of the project has been in the Bakersfield to Fresno corridor, and then if it is extended it is then likely to be extended to the Modesto metropolitan area, or the Stockton—and/or, I think it is at Modesto that there is a bifurcation. The one link of it going then to Stockton and to Sacramento, and the other going to San Jose and San Francisco. And in either case, you have to start somewhere.

When we started to build the interstate highway system, we didn't start in the center of the cities, which would have been very complicated. We started in building those legs of the interstate highway system where it was easy to build them. And that is possible. The right of way, I think, has already been acquired by the California DOT to build the high-speed rail system in that first corridor, in the Bakersfield-Fresno and maybe on to Modesto, as I have understood the developments in the last few weeks as they go on.

So the gentleman's problem is, it seems to me, with what's already been agreed to by California and what is already going forward, moneys that have, some of them been obligated and in place to go, and some of them yet to be obligated, but about to be obligated.

Mr. DENHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. No dispute here on whether or not this bill has any mention of high-speed rail. I would agree. There is no mention of it. And I won't even dispute here tonight whether the President wants to spend more on high-speed rail or whether the Governor wants to spend more money on high-speed rail. That is a different debate.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chair, I will then move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. I think I'm doing the correct thing there. And I'll yield, again, for the continuation of what the gentleman from California is saying.

Mr. DENHAM. Thank you sir. Thank you for yielding.

I would agree that the President can come up with more money if he feels that he wants to transfer more stimulus dollars, or we may have another vote, depending on another allocation or appropriation that may want to spend money on high-speed rail.

This amendment says that our gas tax dollars will go back to California to be used for our highways and roads. That's all this amendment does. That's all I intend to do is to make sure that the Governor of California does not take money out of the block grant from the Federal Government that goes into the STF fund to use it for other things such as high-speed rail. The Governor has to use the money where this Federal Government intends it to be used, very simple.

Mr. OLVER. Reclaiming my time, the language of the amendment, as I have it before me, says none of the funds made available by this Act may be used for high-speed rail in the State of California, or for the California High-Speed Rail Authority.

Mr. DENHAM. Correct.

□ 2230

Mr. OLVER. How does that guarantee that California's gas tax moneys will not be used for high-speed rail?

Mr. DENHAM. As Congress, if in this bill we stipulate that none of the funds can be used for high-speed rail, then none of the funds can be used for high-speed rail. I mean, it's a very simple mandate for the Governor: Use the money where it was intended to be used but not for high-speed rail. The language is very simple. That's why we wrote it as one sentence: that none of the funds may be used for high-speed rail.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Is it your impression that what the gentleman is saying is that they can't take highway trust fund money and put it into high-speed rail and that they can't take transit dollars and put it into high-speed rail?

It would be my understanding, since there is no money in the bill for high-speed rail, that he is talking about other pots of money that would go to California and about just trying to wall that off from being used. That's my understanding. Maybe the gentleman has a different interpretation.

Mr. OLVER. At this point, I really don't know whether your understanding is anywhere close to mine. I think this is an amendment deserving of opposition, so I am opposing the amendment. I think this amendment

should not be adopted, and you can do as you wish.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANDRY

Mr. LANDRY. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to promulgate or implement any regulations that would mandate global positioning system (GPS) tracking, electronic on-board recording devices, or event data recorders in passenger or commercial motor vehicles.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANDRY. I am honored to join my distinguished colleagues, Ranking Member RAHALL, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. TOM GRAVES, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, on this amendment.

Our bipartisan amendment prohibits any funds under this act to be used to implement any administration mandate for global positioning systems, electronic onboard recorders, or event data recording devices on both passenger and commercial vehicles.

Madam Chairman, the Department of Transportation has become obsessed with electronically monitoring vehicle movements. Right now, the DOT is working on a mandate which would require that every car have a device which is very similar to an airplane's black box. Additionally, they are working on another mandate which would require that trucks carry an electronic onboard recorder. Even the name sounds scary. These devices would record and transmit data when the truck is in use.

This regulation is so costly that even President Obama has singled it out as a regulation which needs more study. He did so because it is estimated that the mandate will cost the trucking industry at least \$1 billion to implement.

Madam Chairman, the truckers in my district cannot afford this cost. I know some companies like these devices. That's great. They can put them in their trucks voluntarily. However, just because a few companies like the devices, we should not mandate that everyone use them. For this reason, I

hope the House will adopt this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I withdraw my reservation of the point of order, and I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I appreciate very much the gentleman's concern on this amendment. I think his timing is, maybe, unfortunate. This is a major issue in the reauthorization bill that, hopefully, is going to be filed tonight. This issue will be dealt with. It truly is an authorizing issue that should not be on this bill.

So, while I may share some concerns with the gentleman, I certainly don't think it's appropriate on this bill, especially at this moment when the highway bill is being filed and when, hopefully, this issue will be resolved in that bill.

With that and with some reservation, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, unfortunately.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. I think that what the chairman has said is probably about as good as it gets.

What we have now is a slightly amended version of the proposal. My understanding is that the major long-distance trucking companies are against this language and that most of the safety advocates are against this language but that there are other trucking interests that favor this language or that are happy with this language. So you have a real controversy among people.

Of the long-distance truckers and safety advocates, I would generally think that that is something we should worry about; but as the chairman has said, this is an issue that really ought to be in the hands of the authorizers and worked out by the authorizers. That may or may not be dealt with in the authorization legislation, but in any case, the limitation on funds is effective only for this 1-year appropriations bill.

Mr. LANDRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LANDRY. I have heard from some of my colleagues and outside groups, and they would argue that this is not the time to have this debate.

But if not now, when? When will we publicly debate the issue? We are waiting on a conference report of which we know not what's in it. So this is the time. I would argue that this is the time for us to have that debate.

To be clear, just because a few big companies in this country want these types of devices, what about the small

business owners out there that everyone on both sides of the aisle continually come to this mic and propose that they support when our actions of opposing this amendment would say to the big corporations, "I'm with you," and to the little guys, "I'm not"?

Mr. OLVER. In reclaiming my time, maybe the gentleman understands and I simply do not.

Who is about to promulgate regulations in this area of mandating global positioning systems, electronic on-board recording devices and so forth? Where is the action to do that? Where is the problem here?

Mr. LANDRY. In the Department of Transportation, is my understanding.

□ 2240

Mr. OLVER. My very competent staff tells me that we have been requiring this in the Mexican trucking controversy over the past few years.

We've been fighting over that one back and forth for years and years now, and I can't remember whether there was or wasn't that sort of thing there. I don't remember it having come up before at any point.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairwoman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to implement any rule or regulation that expressly prohibits an owner or landlord of housing from using a criminal conviction to deny housing to an applicant for such housing.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Chair, this amendment is very limited and straightforward to deal with a problem that we've started getting a lot of calls from Realtors in our district, as I'm sure many of my colleagues across the country are receiving, as well as property owners who own apartment units and other types of housing that are rented out.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has recently come out with a rule called the "disparity impact rule," and it's not a final rule that has been issued yet. We're just trying to make a narrow clarification

that would allow property owners to be able to check and make sure that if somebody has a criminal conviction that that person could be prevented from moving into an apartment complex, for example, where you've got single mothers with young children.

Every single day in this country, property owners use background checks to check on criminal records of people that are applying for housing. This has nothing to do with violations of the Fair Housing Act. It's just a basic common practice that property owners use every day to make sure that somebody that's looking to move into housing doesn't have a criminal record. Some property owners can look at that, and some property owners can choose not to be concerned about that. But many millions of property owners across the country do look at whether or not somebody has got a criminal conviction in determining whether or not they will rent them housing. It's not only to protect the property owner who has in many cases hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not millions of dollars, invested in that property, but also to protect the other residents who are renting property at that apartment.

So this new rule that's come out jeopardizes the ability of those property owners to look and make sure that somebody doesn't have a criminal conviction on their record. What this amendment would do would just ensure that if the Department of Housing and Urban Development goes forward with this rule, that the rule won't prevent somebody from using a tool that has been in the hands of property owners for generations just to make sure that somebody doesn't have a criminal conviction when they're moving into this housing unit that they own.

Again, I will use the example of a sex offender. There are sex offenders in most States, including my State of Louisiana. There are strict requirements of what somebody has to comply with if they're a convicted sex offender. They have to register, and they have to do a lot of other things. But if somebody doesn't comply with that law—and there are always cases we find of people who don't comply with that law—you don't know if when you're renting property to somebody whether or not they are a sex offender. But if you choose to do that background check and see if they've got that criminal conviction on their record, then you can say: Wait a minute, you're not coming into my apartment complex and jeopardizing the safety of those young children that already rent from me because we're going to make sure that if you've got that background check that shows that you're a sex offender, you're going to be denied.

Yet this new rule jeopardizes their ability to carry out what is a basic enforcement mechanism that property owners all across the country use every day to protect their properties. We just want to make sure that as it relates to

criminal convictions, that property owners can continue to look at that and make sure that that is something that they're not going to be found in violation of a law if they use that mechanism.

This is a simple amendment. I would urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HERRERA
BEUTLER

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to build flood protection walls for Interstate 5 between mile posts 72-82 in Lewis County, Washington.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Madam Chairman, the reason I bring this amendment to the desk is because there are families, there are businesses, moms and dads in Lewis County on I-5 that have experienced devastating flooding. In fact, at one of my meetings back there, I met a wonderful older woman who has lived in that county for decades, and she said to me, Honey, when it starts to rain outside, I get terrified. I don't know if I should put all my valuables in the attic and I should leave the house. That's because in 2007, Madam Chairman, this county experienced devastating flooding. And every time it rains, the residents wonder if this is going to be the next catastrophic flood that they lose their businesses, lose their homes, and that devastates families.

Our State legislature and locals in the community in Lewis County have been seeking a basin-wide solution to flood protection. The Army Corps of Engineers has spent decades studying this issue, and the time of the study is over. We also need a solution that isn't going to wall off the twin cities in Lewis County by erecting an 11-mile levee that basically turns those cities into a bathtub.

With this amendment, I was seeking to prohibit that bathtub effect, so to speak, so as to protect the businesses and the families and the commerce that take place. We can come up with a better solution. However, Madam Chairman, because this is such an important issue, and I want to make sure that we do this right, I'm going to withdraw my amendment at this time.

Actually before I do so, Madam Chairman, would it be possible to ask a question of the subcommittee chairman?

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. LATHAM. I understand the concerns you have, and I would look forward to working with you as we get towards conference to try and address your concerns on this very important issue, obviously, for your constituents and would be pleased to be of any kind of assistance we possibly could.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

With that, I withdraw my amendment, Madam Chairman, and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

□ 2250

Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I believe we are coming to the end here, and I just want to make a couple of comments.

As far as the gentleman from Massachusetts, once again, this will be his last appropriation bill on the floor as the ranking member and a former chairman of this subcommittee. Mr. OLVER has done an outstanding job over the years. We don't always agree on everything. Do we, JOHN? But we work very, very well together. And I just want to wish you and your wife the best.

You are a great partner and someone who I admire very, very much—your intelligence, your ability to look in detail at programs. And we kid each other—or I kid Mr. OLVER a lot about maybe having debates inside his mind sometimes in committee. But he's always extraordinarily thoughtful and someone, again, that I admire very, very much.

Madam Chairman, we've been through a 2-day process here. We have gone through a lot of amendments. I believe that we are to the point where we can bring this effort to a conclusion.

And I would, again, thank Mr. OLVER, thank the staff, the professional staff on both sides, on the majority and on the minority side, for doing such an outstanding job. Working together is very difficult sometimes on these bills. Also, in my office, Doug Bobbitt does such a fabulous job working on this bill for me. But I just want to say thank you to everyone.

Madam Chairwoman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development,

and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1380

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1380.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Hahn moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4348 be instructed to agree to the freight policy provisions in Sec. 1115, Sec. 33002, Sec. 33003, and Sec. 33005 of the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

My motion to instruct the conferees would be in favor of the Senate language as it relates to freight and goods movement. It would authorize a national freight plan, national surface transportation and freight policy, and a port infrastructure development initiative.

We have all heard that the conference report is close to being filed. I have also heard that the Senate freight provisions are not in the final agreement. I want to come to the floor tonight and make one last attempt to ensure that our country has a national freight policy.

Madam Speaker, the Port of Los Angeles is in my backyard; and when I was on the city council in Los Angeles, I focused on transporting the goods that arrive in the port to the rest of the Nation. When I came to Congress almost a year ago, I was surprised that there was not enough attention on our ports, and I was surprised that we didn't even have a ports caucus. So I cofounded the bipartisan Ports Caucus with my good friend, TED POE from Texas, to educate the rest of our Members on the importance of our ports and goods movement to our Nation's economy. So first, for those who don't know what "goods movement" is, I would like to talk about why it's crucial for our Nation.

We are a consumer economy. Whether it is a mom-and-pop store on the corner or a large retailer like Target, we don't think twice when we go to these store to purchase groceries, toys for our children or clothing. When we go to the store, we expect that the milk and the Barbie dolls are on the shelf.

Simply, goods movement is transporting products, whether they are made in America or imported through our Nation's ports to retail stores. The goods that are transported throughout the country are transported by freight rail, trucks and, in some cases, waterways. The efficient transportation of these goods is crucial for our economy. We need to invest in all modes of transportation for freight, including roads, rail, and grade crossings to reduce bottlenecks.

But, Madam Speaker, this Nation does not focus enough resources on freight policy and goods movement. We don't have a national freight plan to guide us. According to Robert Puentes at the Brookings Institute:

The Nation has no comprehensive strategy or plan for the maintenance and development of transportation assets related to international freight movement. The country's freight transportation industry is highly decentralized, with private operators owning almost all of the trucks and rails, and the public sector owning the roads, airports, and waterway rights. And unlike our international peers, such as Germany, Canada, and Australia, the United States doesn't have a unified strategy that aligns disparate owners and interests around national economic objectives.

Madam Speaker, without a national plan, we have bottlenecks transporting our goods. For example, goods that leave the Port of Los Angeles take 48 hours to arrive in Chicago and take another 30 hours to travel across the city. What does this bottleneck and others like it mean? It means higher costs for consumers, more congestion, more pollution, and fewer jobs.

□ 2300

We need to stop this piecemeal system and develop a national plan. It's so crucial that we develop this plan now because the amount of freight will increase drastically in the next 20 years. In southern California, it is expected to triple.

In addition, this administration wants to double the exports by 2014. And I think we need to have an efficient system to export our products overseas. This will provide opportunities for our small businesses. And we need to prepare for that increase. According to the Federal Highway Administration, the U.S. surface transportation network, which includes rail and highway, is reaching or has reached capacity in many areas. The congestion largely stems from the lack of capacity to meet traffic demand and lack of infrastructure.

A U.S. Department of Transportation report, "Freight Transportation Improvements and the Economy," esti-

mates the cost of carrying freight on the highway system at between \$25 and \$200 an hour. Unexpected delays can increase the cost of transporting goods by 50 to 250 percent. Because the supply chain is a "network of retailers, distributors, transporters, storage facilities, and suppliers that participate in the sale, delivery, and production of a particular product," congestion resulting in unreliable trip times and missed deliveries can have major business implications, which adds cost at every link of the supply chain.

If the transportation function is efficient, manufacturing and retail firms can carry less inventory because they can rely on goods being delivered when and where they are needed. If the transportation system is congested and unreliable, a firm must carry more inventory to ensure production processes are uninterrupted and the availability of goods is maintained.

Carrying inventory is not free. Not only is a firm's capital tied up in the inventory, but it must be stored and insured. This model of business carrying more inventories to buffer transportation unreliability costs money to the companies and ultimately to the consumer.

One of the reasons that I like working on ports and freight policy is because it's a bipartisan issue. It's something we can find common middle ground on. For example, Bob Poole of the libertarian Reason Foundation stated:

Goods-movement infrastructure has not gotten enough attention in recent decades, either at the Federal level or in the transportation plans of urban area Metropolitan Planning Organizations. The larger question before us is what the Federal Government's direct role should be.

Mr. Poole continues:

Despite my general decentralist leanings, I agree that facilitating free flow of commerce—with the world and among States—is one of the tasks the Constitution gives to the Federal Government. I'm favorable to the idea of the Federal Government making strategic investments in critical corridors and key nodes in the goods-movement system. And obviously, this needs to involve all the modes that make economic sense for shippers to move cargo.

What organizations support a national freight plan? In addition to many transportation and port organizations, a national freight plan is supported by the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Retail Federation. The Chamber of Commerce recently sent a letter this month to the conference committee stating:

The reliable and timely movement of goods is critical to U.S. economic health. Unfortunately, the condition and capacity of the transportation system has failed to keep up with the growth in trade volume and freight movement. Congestion caused by bottlenecks threaten to choke future economic growth. The Chamber believes the Senate-passed bill includes strong provisions to establish a freight program that would improve regional and national freight movement by targeting investments and improvements that would demonstrably facilitate

the movement of freight, such as truck-only lanes, railway-highway grade separations, and improvements to freight intermodal connectors.

As part of the Freight Stakeholders Coalition, the retailers stated:

Substantial investment in the Nation's freight transportation system must be given a high priority. Without the ability to quickly and cost-effectively move goods into, out of, and through the United States, America will not be able to maintain our high standard of living and high employment levels.

I also have letters of support from the American Trucking Association and the American Association of Port Authorities in support of this motion, as well as many other supporters.

We all know that congestion—especially truck congestion on our highways—causes air pollution. In my part of the country, South Coast Air Quality Management District said that diesel emissions are responsible for 71 percent of the major pollutants in the region. This means more asthma in our children and more cancer. Eliminating congestion will help improve air quality and our Nation's health.

Also, America's farmers would benefit from a national freight policy. Not only do America's farmers provide food in our grocery stores and on our table, but they feed the world as well. America is the world's bread basket. The U.S. is the world's top wheat exporter. And all that grain needs to be transported from America's heartland to our ports. It is crucial that we have the infrastructure to transport our goods from California or the Midwest to export them.

In conclusion, last week, the PORTS Caucus met with Transportation Secretary LaHood. He said the Department was beginning to plan a national freight policy but that Congress needed to prioritize goods movement. This is our chance. The last transportation bill was passed 7 years ago. We cannot wait another 7 years before we make a national commitment and a priority for a freight policy in this country.

I urge my colleagues to vote for my motion, and I reserve the balance of my time.

AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS,
Arlington, VA, June 27, 2012.

Hon. JANICE HAHN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN HAHN: The American Trucking Associations would like to express our strong support for your motion to instruct conferees to support MAP-21's freight provisions. In particular, ATA believes that full funding for the National Freight Program in Sec. 1115 is an essential step toward addressing the nation's most critical freight transportation bottlenecks. Approximately 60% of the U.S. economy moves on the back of trucks, and inefficiencies in major truck routes will negatively affect economic output and job creation. We are pleased that MAP-21 recognizes the critical importance of efficient freight networks by focusing a portion of available funding on highway freight projects, and we join you in urging the conference committee to retain the Sec. 1115 program and other important freight-related elements of MAP-21.

Thank you for your support of these provisions. We hope to be of continuing assistance throughout the reauthorization process.

Sincerely,

Bill Graves.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF PORT AUTHORITIES,
Alexandria, VA, June 27, 2012.

Hon. JANICE HAHN,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: We write this letter today to voice the American Association of Port Authorities' (AAPA) strong support for your motion to instruct the conferees to agree to the freight policy provisions in MAP 21. AAPA promotes the common interests of the port community and provides leadership on trade, transportation, environmental and other issues related to port development and operations. The creation of a national freight policy is one of AAPA's top policy goals for surface transportation authorization. These provisions are important to seaports' ability to efficiently connect America to the global economy and help our nation plan for future freight growth. A recent Corps of Engineers study noted that over the next 30 years, the U.S. population is expected to increase 32 percent, while imports should increase fourfold and exports (so critical to our economic growth) are projected to see a sevenfold increase. These freight provisions are important to our ability to plan for this increased trade and avoid gridlock.

AAPA urges Congress to support the provisions in MAP 21 which provide for a national freight program and policy in the surface transportation authorization bill. Freight and goods movement often cross state lines and are best planned for in more comprehensive ways. This transportation bill aims to reform our transportation programs and including freight is critical to developing a system focused on the needs of the future.

Now more than ever, the needs of our goods movement network must be addressed as system use continues to grow in lockstep with America's recovering economy. The inclusion of a national freight plan with supporting policies, strategy and funding will help ensure America's international competitiveness, create jobs and bolster the U.S. economic recovery.

Thank you for your consideration of these important issues.

Sincerely,

KURT J. NAGLE.

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This motion instructs conferees to the surface transportation reauthorization conference to agree to several provisions in the Senate bill relating to freight policy. As I'm sure you're aware, the conferees and their staffs have been working around the clock, and it is our hope to file a bipartisan, bicameral agreement as soon as possible.

This agreement is aimed to tackle serious issues facing the infrastructure of the United States, which is the utmost importance to the stability and future growth of the American economy.

As soon as it's filed, I encourage the gentlewoman from California to review the conference report and take special note of the freight policy language that a majority of the House and majority of the Senate conferees chose to include.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HAHN. I appreciate my colleague from California saying that. But, again, I have letters of support from major organizations who felt like the freight policy language was not as good as the Senate bill. Just to make clear, the freight policy in the Senate bill does not increase the total cost of the bill. And by leaving the provisions that I talked about out of the final bill, we're not reducing the cost of the bill, and we're not reducing the deficit.

I just think the Senate language really sets forth something that I think we've never done in this country, and that's really to prioritize and to understand the importance of moving forward and being competitive in this global economy and establishing once and for all a comprehensive freight policy that will put goods-movement at a level that I think it should be.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. I am prepared to close if the gentlelady is prepared to yield back.

Ms. HAHN. I am ready to close, too. The hour is late. For those of you watching C-SPAN, it's nearing the final hour of the day. It's past 11 p.m. But I really did feel like one of the reasons I did come to Congress was to raise the level of importance of our ports, of goods movement, of cargo, what it means to this economy, what it means to jobs, and I just wanted to give it one last shot that we might instruct the conferees to include what I think is the better language in the final transportation bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2310

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I will just close by saying that I can appreciate the gentlewoman from California's passion on this issue. I, too, see the great ports of California and throughout the Nation and the need to have an overall freight policy, and I look forward to working with her in the future on this very important issue.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 33. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to specify when certain securities issued in connection with church plans are treated as exempted securities for purposes of that Act.

H.R. 2297. An act to promote the development of the Southwest waterfront in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3187. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 28, 2012, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first and second quarters of 2012 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO QATAR, AFGHANISTAN, AND HUNGARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 10 AND MAY 15, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	5/11	5/12	Qatar		233.74		(³)				233.74
Hon. Jean Schmidt	5/11	5/12	Qatar		339.74		(³)				339.74
Hon. Anna Eshoo	5/11	5/12	Qatar		339.74		(³)				339.74
Hon. Carolyn Maloney	5/11	5/12	Qatar		339.74		(³)				339.74
Hon. Terri Sewell	5/11	5/12	Qatar		339.74		(³)				339.74
Dr. Brian Monahan	5/11	5/12	Qatar		220.74		(³)				220.74
Wyndee Parker	5/11	5/12	Qatar		309.74		(³)				309.74
Drew Hammill	5/11	5/12	Qatar		339.74		(³)				339.74
Bridget Fallon	5/11	5/13	Qatar		679.48		1,341.55				2,021.03
Bina Surgeon	5/11	5/13	Qatar		679.48		1,341.55				2,021.03
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	5/12	5/13	Afghanistan				(³)				
Hon. Jean Schmidt	5/12	5/13	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
Hon. Anna Eshoo	5/12	5/13	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
Hon. Carolyn Maloney	5/12	5/13	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
Hon. Terri Sewell	5/12	5/13	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
Dr. Brian Monahan	5/12	5/13	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
Wyndee Parker	5/12	5/13	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
Drew Hammill	5/12	5/13	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	5/13	5/15	Hungary		389.10		(³)				389.10
Hon. Jean Schmidt	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(³)				506.00
Hon. Anna Eshoo	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(³)				506.00
Hon. Carolyn Maloney	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(³)				506.00
Hon. Terri Sewell	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(³)				506.00
Dr. Brian Monahan	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(³)				506.00
Wyndee Parker	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(³)				506.00
Drew Hammill	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(³)				506.00
Bridget Fallon	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(³)				506.00
Bina Surgeon	5/13	5/15	Hungary		506.00		(³)				506.00
Committee total											11,644.08

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, June 9, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate, and return. ☒¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. SAM GRAVES, Chairman, June 7, 2012.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6658. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Killed, nonviable *Streptomyces acidiscabies* strain RL-110T; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0078; FRL-9348-7] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6659. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Richard K. Gallagher, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6660. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirements of Rear Admiral (lower half) Craig S. Faller and Captain Dwight D. Shepherd, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral and rear admiral (lower half), respectively; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6661. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "2010 Impact and Effectiveness of Administration for Native Americans (ANA) Projects

Report"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6662. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting annual financial report as required by the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act of 2008 for FY 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6663. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting fiscal year 2011 Performance Report to Congress for the Animal Drug User Fee Act, as amended; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6664. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to Federal Implementation Plans to Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0491; FRL-9672-4] (RIN: 2060-AR35) received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6665. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Regional Haze [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0080; FRL-9638-3] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6666. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation

of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Permit to Construct Exemptions [EPA-R03-2010-0394; FRL-9684-9] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6667. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota; Regional Haze [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0037; FRL-9683-5] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6668. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0091, EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0584; FRL-9685-2] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6669. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Illinois; Redesignation of the Illinois Portion of the St. Louis, MO-IL Area to Attainment for the 1997 8-hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0523; FRL-9683-7] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6670. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arizona; Update to Stage II Gasoline Vapor Recovery Program; Change in the Definition of "Gasoline" to Exclude "E85" [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0717; FRL-9661-3] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6671. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Minor New Source Review (NSR) Preconstruction Permitting Rule for Cotton Gins [EPA-R06-OAR-2005-NM-0008; FRL-9684-5] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6672. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plan; Arizona; Attainment Plan for 1997 8-hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0253; FRL-9682-5] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6673. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Control of Air Pollution From Aircraft and Aircraft Engines; Emission Standards and Test Procedures [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0687; FRL-9678-1] (RIN: 2060-A070) received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6674. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Failure to Attain by 2005 and Determination of Current Attainment of the 1-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards in the Baltimore Nonattainment Area in Maryland [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0680; FRL-9685-5] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6675. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of Arizona; Pinal County; PM10 [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0491; FRL-9679-7] received May 25, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6676. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Direct Final Negative Declaration and Withdrawal of Large Municipal Waste Combustors State Plan for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Illinois [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0312; FRL-9679-6] received May 25, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6677. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Elemental Mercury Used in Barometers, Manometers, Hygrometers, and Psychrometers; Significant New Use Rule [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2010-0630; FRL-9345-9] (RIN: 2070-AJ71) received May 25, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6678. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Heavy-Duty Highway Program: Revisions for Emergency Vehicles [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-1032; FRL-9673-1] (RIN: A2060-AR54) received May 25, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6679. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Alternative for the Motor Vehicle Air Conditioning Sector under the Significant New Alternatives Policy (SNAP) Program [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0488; FRL-9668-8] (RIN: 2060-AM54) received May 25, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6680. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rule on a Certain Chemical Substance; Withdrawal of Significant New Use Rule [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2011-0942; FRL-9350-3] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received May 25, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6681. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Safety Evaluation for Topical Report WCAP-17236-NP, Revision 0, "Risk-Informed Extension of the Reactor Vessel Nozzle Inservice Inspection Interval" received June 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6682. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 12-25, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6683. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 12-23, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6684. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 5 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of major general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6685. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a declaration of a national emergency with respect to blocking the property of the Government of the Russian Federation, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(b); (H. Doc. No. 112—119); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

6686. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-380, "District Department of Transportation Grant Authority Temporary Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6687. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-384, "Youth Bullying Prevention Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6688. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2011 to March 1, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6689. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6690. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting pursuant to Title II, Section 203, of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act (No FEAR Act), the Department's annual report for FY 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6691. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2011, through March 31, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6692. A letter from the General Counsel and Acting Executive Director, Election Assistance Commission, transmitting Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6693. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General of the Federal Labor Relations Board for the period beginning October 1, 2011 and ending March 31, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6694. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6695. A letter from the Executive Director, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, transmitting the Commission's audited Seventy-First Financial Statement for the period of October 1, 2010 to September 30, 2011 pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6696. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period October 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6697. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Award Fee for Service and End-Item Contracts (RIN: 2700-AD70) received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Legislative Review and Oversight Activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs During the 112th Congress (Rept. 112-552). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NUGENT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 708. Resolution relating to the consideration of House Report 112-546 and an accompanying resolution, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 706) authorizing the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas. (Rept. 112-553). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr.

WATT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 6029. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for increased penalties for foreign and economic espionage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 6030. A bill to provide a temporary tax credit for increased payroll, to eliminate certain tax benefits for major integrated oil companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 6031. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the production and investment tax credits for wind facilities and to modify the foreign tax credit rules applicable to major integrated oil companies which are dual capacity taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 6032. A bill to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 6033. A bill to provide for research and education to improve screening, detection and diagnosis of prostate cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. STARK, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 6034. A bill to provide for the establishment of a task force to conduct a study to analyze the challenges faced by agricultural areas and rural communities designated as an area having special flood hazards for purposes of the National Flood Insurance Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. RICHARDSON (for herself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 6035. A bill to promote permanent families for children, privacy and safety for unwed mothers, responsible fatherhood, and security for adoptive parents by establishing a National Responsible Father Registry and encouraging States to enter into agreements to contribute the information contained in the State's Responsible Father Registry to the National Responsible Father Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. McKEON):

H.R. 6036. A bill to require a report by the Secretary of State on whether the Haqqani Network meets the criteria for designation as a foreign terrorist organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado (for himself and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 6037. A bill to include focusing on credit availability in the mission of each Federal banking regulator, to provide insured depository institutions with certain amortization authority and authority to include allowances for loan and lease losses when calculating the institution's capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. BONO MACK, Ms. CHU, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. DICKS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FARR, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KISSELL, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 6038. A bill to strengthen the role of the United States in the international community of nations in conserving natural resources to further global prosperity and security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 6039. A bill to preserve the Green Mountain Lookout in the Glacier Peak Wilderness of the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KELLY, Mr. SABLON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RIVERA, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 6040. A bill to approve the Agreement providing terms for a continuation of the free association between the United States and Palau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 6041. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall require the disclosure of political contributions as a condition of accepting bids for oil and gas leases of Federal onshore and offshore lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 6042. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to reform the Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MARINO, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 6043. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Social Security Act to extend health information technology assistance eligibility to behavioral health, mental health, and substance abuse professionals and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 6044. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to accept voluntary services from veterans and veterans service organizations at national cemeteries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 6045. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to reauthorize the juvenile accountability block grants program through fiscal year 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 6046. A bill to amend titles 10, 32, 37, and 38 of the United States Code, to add a definition of spouse for purposes of military personnel policies and military and veteran benefits that recognizes new State definitions of spouse; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (for herself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DENT, Ms. CHU, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Res. 709. A resolution welcoming His Holiness, Hadhrat Mirza Masroor Ahmad, the worldwide spiritual and administrative head of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, to Washington, DC, and recognizing his commitment to world peace, justice, non-violence, human rights, religious freedom, and democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H. Res. 710. A resolution congratulating Ichiro Suzuki, outfielder for the Seattle Mariners, for becoming the third fastest player in the history of Major League Baseball to amass 2,500 hits; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 6029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 6030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 6031.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 6032.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power of Congress to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress and the Executive Branch), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States) of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 6033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States"

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 6034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 6035.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 6036.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill relates to matters concerning the foreign policy and national security of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides, in pertinent part, that "Congress shall have power ... to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States"; "... to raise and support armies..."; "To provide and maintain a Navy"; "To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces"; and "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado:

H.R. 6037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authorities on which this bill rests is:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution

This states that "Congress shall have power to ... regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states,

and with the Indian tribes." The power to regulate commerce among the several states is the power to define conditions and rules for commercial transactions, and the regulation of the prices and terms of sale. Establishing regulations which govern the monetary policies federal banking regulators dictate financial institutions must follow, and the interactions between those regulators and institutions, affects the ability of these institutions to conduct business transactions with clients among the several states, and thus falls under the commerce clause.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 6038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 6039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress."

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 6040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 6041.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 6042.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 18, Clause 8;

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6043.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, commonly referred to for this purpose as the Commerce Clause, which states the following: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 6044.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clauses 12, 13, 14, 18.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 6045.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution; and

Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 6046.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution and in pursuit of the Equal Protection Clause found in section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 94: Mr. PITTS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 192: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 265: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 273: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 303: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 345: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 350: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 459: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. PITTS, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 547: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 733: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. BUERKLE, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 860: Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 890: Mr. BONNER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. MEHAN.

H.R. 894: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 904: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 905: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 997: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1048: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 1054: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1111: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 1244: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1325: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1394: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1404: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1416: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1464: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 1475: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1519: Mr. COSTA, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1546: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1621: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1639: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1733: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1755: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 1792: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1860: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1903: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2032: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 2082: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2139: Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 2194: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 2198: Mr. PAUL and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 2200: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2299: Mr. HURT.

H.R. 2304: Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 2418: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 2479: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2492: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2505: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2655: Mr. GUTHRIE and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2672: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2758: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2812: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2861: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2962: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2963: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2980: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2997: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 3000: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3086: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3187: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. REED, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, and Mr. HULTGREEN.

H.R. 3192: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 3364: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3395: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3423: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 3458: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3522: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.

H.R. 3586: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 3605: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 3612: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3618: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 3619: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 3658: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
H.R. 3682: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 3762: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 3767: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 3798: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 3803: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 3816: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 3832: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 3984: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4004: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 4062: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4066: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 4155: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 4192: Mr. COHEN and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4236: Mr. LOEBACK.
H.R. 4238: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 4296: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 4306: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 4318: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 4321: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 4323: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 4326: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4342: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 4345: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 4367: Mr. KLINE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4373: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 4405: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 4470: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4643: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 4740: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4972: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5129: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5542: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 5646: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 5684: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 5707: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 5717: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 5741: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 5796: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 5799: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 5822: Mr. GOWDY.
H.R. 5864: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 5873: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 5879: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 5881: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 5893: Mr. LANCE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 5910: Mr. OWENS and Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 5916: Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 5924: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 5939: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 5942: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 5943: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H.R. 5951: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
H.R. 5953: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 5957: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 5959: Ms. DELAULO and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 5960: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 5976: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 5978: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 5998: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 6009: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 6016: Mr. SCHILLING.
H.R. 6019: Mr. REYES and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 6028: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.J. Res. 69: Mr. CARNEY.
H.J. Res. 90: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. REYES.
H.J. Res. 110: Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRAVACK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. AKIN.
H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. TURNER of New York.
H. Con. Res. 116: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. OLSON.

H. Res. 134: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 298: Mr. REYES, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GUINTA, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Res. 351: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 397: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H. Res. 475: Mr. SCALISE.
H. Res. 662: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Res. 672: Mr. WELCH.
H. Res. 689: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BACA, Mr. HIMES, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BOREN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. WATT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
H. Res. 694: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. DELAULO, Ms. HAHN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H. Res. 701: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H. Res. 702: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1380: Mr. LANDRY.